STRUGGLE OF THE CPSU FOR UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY PUBLISHING HOUSE

STRUGGLE

OF THE CPSU

FOR UNITY

OF THE

INTERNATIONAL

COMMUNIST

MOVEMENT

NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY PUBLISHING HOUSE

THE DECISION OF THE CPSU PLENARY MEETING

Adopted on February 15, 1964

Having heard and discussed the report of Presidium Member and Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU Comrade M. A. Suslov "Struggle of the CPSU for Unity of the International Communist Movement", the Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU expresses its profound concern over the splitting activities of the leadership of the Communist Party of China which are doing great damage to the socialist community of nations, to the whole of the world communist and working-class movement.

Aware of the historical importance of the unity and solidarity of the Communist movement, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has lately made new steps towards the overcoming or, at least in the early stages, narrowing down the differences between the leadership of the CPC and the CPSU and other fraternal parties, towards strengthening the economic and political co-operation between the USSR and the CPR. Attempts to halt the process of aggravating the differences have also been made by other Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU notes with regret that the leadership of the CPC has neither respon-

ded to this initiative, nor provided an answer to the letter of the CPSU, nor stopped the open polemics; on the contrary it has intensified the campaign against the general line of the Communist movement defined by the Meetings of 1957 and 1960.

Under the cover of verbal assurances of fidelity to Marxism-Leninism, under the banner of struggle against the imaginary revisionism of the Marxist-Leninist Parties the leaders of the CPC have launched an attack on the basic theoretical and political principles with which the Communist movement guides itself at the present stage.

New appraisals and conclusions worked out by the collective effort of the fraternal parties on the basis of the creative application of the Marxist-Leninist principles to the present day conditions — on the role of the world socialist system, on the ways of building socialism and communism, on the possibility of averting a world war, on peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, on the necessity of struggle against the ideology and practice of the personality cult, on the forms of transition to socialism in the developed capitalist states and in the countries which have liberated themselves from colonialism — all this is distorted by the Chinese leaders.

Having departed from all basic problems of the strategy and tactics of the Leninist line in the world Communist movement, the Chinese leaders have proclaimed their course which is a mixture of petty-bourgeois adventurism and great-power chauvinism. They are actually sliding down in a number of problems to the Trotskyite positions, adopting the Trotskyite methods of struggle against the Marxist-Leninist Parties, and knocking together factional groups of their supporters in various countries. The leadership of the CPC is trying to impose its specific ideological platform upon the whole of the socialist camp and the world Communist movement, the international democratic organizations.

The Chinese leaders have taken the course of worsening Soviet-Chinese interstate relations, and undermining the friendship between the Soviet and Chinese peoples. Having

rejected all the proposals of the CC CPSU on the normalisation of Soviet-Chinese relations, they have intensified anti-Soviet propaganda inside the CPR and are grossly interfering in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union.

The Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU hold that the vital interests of the world socialist system, of the Communist movement and the defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism call for an ideological exposure of the anti-Leninist position of the CPC leadership and for a resolute rebuff to their splitting activities.

Fully and unanimously approving the political and practical activity of the Presidium of the CC CPSU and of Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, First Secretary of the CC CPSU, aimed at building Communist society in the USSR, ensuring the triumph of the cause of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism, strengthening the solidarity of the Marxist-Leninist parties, the Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU instructs the CC Presidium to go on firmly upholding the general line of the world communist movement, to work for a stronger unity of all the revolutionary forces of today.

Our Party is following, and will continue to follow, the tested Leninist road and nobody will ever succeed in diverting the CPSU from this course — the course of the 20th and 22nd Congresses.

In spite of the fact that the Chinese leaders have gone far in their splitting activities, the Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU, guiding itself, above all, by the interests of the unity of the world Communist movement, expresses its readiness to exert further efforts toward the normalisation of relations between the CPSU and the CPC. If the CPC leaders have not completely lost the awareness of their international responsibility, they must realise, at last, that by their splitting activities they are diverting the forces and attention of the Communist and Workers' Parties from the solution of the urgent tasks of socialist construction, impeding the struggle against imperialism, and doing harm to the whole of the anti-imperialist front.

The Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU expresses firm confidence that the world Communist movement will overcome the existing difficulties, rally still closer under the banner of Marx-Engels-Lenin and achieve new successes in the struggle for the great cause of the working class, for the cause of peace and the security of the peoples, for the victory of communism.

STRUGGLE OF THE CPSU FOR UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Report of Mikhail Suslov at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU on February 14, 1964

Comrades, this Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU has examined basic questions of agricultural development, questions that are of the utmost importance to our country, to the Soviet people. This Plenary Meeting is working in an atmosphere of complete unanimity among the Central Committee, the entire Party, the whole Soviet people. Its decisions will open up broad vistas for Soviet economy and vast opportunities for a steady rise of socialist agriculture, for the bloom of our country's production forces, for the creation of the material and technical basis of communism and for the fullest satisfaction of the material and spiritual requirements of Soviet people.

In showing constant concern for the development of the country's economy, our Party is fulfilling its internationalist duty to the working people of the whole world. The more considerable our economic successes, the better is the life of the Soviet people, the higher is the prestige of the world's first socialist state and the greater is the attractive force of the ideas of socialism and communism. By their tireless labour the Soviet people are making their contribution towards strengthening the world socialist system and rendering increasing aid and support to the struggle of the peoples of all countries for social and national liberation, against imperialism and colonialism.

The revolutionary process, which has embraced all the continents of the world, continues to develop in breadth and depth. New successes have been scored in the development of the world socialist system. The working-class movement in the capitalist countries is gaining strength. The national liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America is broadening out. The superiority of the forces of socialism and peace over the forces of imperialism and war is becoming ever more clear cut. Through the joint efforts of the world socialist system and all other peace-loving forces it has become possible to achieve a certain relaxation of international tension and take further important steps towards consolidating peace and disrupting the attempts of the most aggressive imperialist circles to start a thermonuclear war. The course of world development fully bears out the correctness of the general line worked out for the international communist movement at the 1957 and 1960 Meetings of the fraternal parties, and the vitality of the conclusions and propositions of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of our Party and of the Leninist Programme of the CPSU.

The achievements of the socialist countries, of the entire world communist movement, are obvious. But our successes could have been much more far-reaching had it not been for the serious difficulties that arose in the socialist camp and the communist movement as a result of the splitting activities of the leaders of the Communist Party of China.

The Central Committee members have been repeatedly informed of the differences between the CPC leadership and the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. However, the Presidium of the CC considered it necessary to raise this question once again at this Plenary Meeting because the Chinese leaders have gone even further in their factional activities and created a direct threat of a split in the world communist movement.

If we analyse the evolution of the views and actions of the CPC leadership, beginning with the 1960 Moscow Meeting, we shall see that during all these years instead of trying to eliminate the differences the Chinese leaders have been making them more acute. Starting out with a revision of certain tactical propositions of the world communist movement, they have, step by step, widened their rift with the CPSU and other fraternal Parties on cardinal problems

of modern times and, in the end, have opposed the general policy of the world communist movement with their own special line, in which the fundamental theses of the Declaration and Statement are being revised from the standpoint of great-power chauvinism and petty-bourgeois adventurism.

The new assessments and conclusions made collectively by the fraternal parties on the basis of a creative application of the principles of Marxism-Leninism to the conditions obtaining in our epoch—on the role of the world socialist system, on the ways of building socialism and communism, on the possibility of averting a world war, on the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, on the need for combating the personality cult ideology and practices, and on the forms of transition to socialism in the developed capitalist countries and in newly-free countries—are distorted and, to all intents and purposes, thrown overboard by the Chinese leadership.

Having to all intents and purposes rejected the Declaration and Statement collectively drawn up by the Communist and Workers' Parties, the CPC leaders offer the fraternal parties their own notorious "25-point programme", which, essentially, boils down to the renunciation of the ever growing influence of the socialist system on the course of world development, a disparaging attitude to the struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries, the setting of the national liberation movement off against the world system of socialism and the international working-class movement, adventurism in foreign policy and the preservation of the state of "cold war", sectarianism and putschism in questions of revolution, the defence and preservation of the personality cult methods and practices, which have been condemned by the communist movement, and justification of the factional struggle in the communist movement.

The Chinese leaders have thus brought their disagreements with the communist movement to such a stage where they have virtually developed into differences on all basic questions.

The participants in this Plenary Meeting know that the CC CPSU has on many occasions shown initiative in an effort to create the conditions for surmounting these differences, for normalising the relations of the CPC with the CPSU and other parties.

Like other Marxist-Leninist parties, we have repeatedly proposed to the CPC leadership that the public polemics be stopped. Such a proposal, in particular, was made in N. S. Khrushchov's speeches on October 25 and November 7, 1963. At the close of November 1963 the Central Committee of the CPSU sent the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China a letter in which a number of concrete proposals were made for eliminating differences and strengthening scientific, technical and cultural co-operation between the USSR and the CPR. In that letter the CC CPSU once again proposed stopping the open polemics. You know, comrades, that during the past few months, acting in conformity with that proposal, the Soviet press has refrained from publishing any polemical material.

How did the Chinese leaders react to these steps? Blinded by nationalist arrogance, they paid no heed to the opinion and appeal of the fraternal parties. They rejected our initiative and took the road of open political struggle against the collectively worked out line of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Chinese press continuously publishes material containing the most flagrant attacks against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. Only after October 25, 1963, the **Jenminjihpao,** organ of the CC CPC, carried more than 200 articles of this nature. Slanderous articles are circulated throughout the world by Chinese organisations and repeatedly broadcast over the radio in foreign languages, and many anti-Soviet articles are broadcast over and over again. Strange as it may seem, but the indoctrination of the Chinese people in a spirit of hostility towards the USSR and the CPSU has now become almost the main aspect of the activity of the CC CPC. A huge propaganda machine is now fully in gear preparing material slurring the CPSU and the Soviet Union.

For its general line, for the brazenness of its attacks against the CPSU, and other Marxist-Leninist parties, Chinese propaganda is increasingly aligning itself with the anti-Soviet, anti-communist organs of the reactionary imperialist circles.

As an example, let us take the article of a series of so-called "answers" to the Open Letter of the CC CPSU of July 14, 1963, published on February 4 by the newspaper **Jenminjihpao** and the magazine **Hungchi.** From first to last, this article, beginning with its heading, **The CPSU Leaders Are the Greatest Splitters of Our Times,** consists of dirty anti-Soviet thrusts and slander against the CC CPSU and its leadership. It has nothing in common with the most elementary norms governing relations between Communists and is an insult to our entire Party, the whole Soviet people. This article contains such wild allegations that our Party "in collusion with US imperialism, world reaction, the Tito clique of renegades and Right-wing Social-Democrats is waging a struggle against fraternal socialist countries, against fraternal parties, against all Marxists-Leninists and revolutionary peoples of the world."

Not very long ago Chinese propaganda aimed its attacks mainly at the CPSU's foreign policy, but now it openly attacks our home policy as well. The CPC leaders are doing their level best to discredit the line adopted at the 20th Congress of the CPSU on all questions, proclaim the struggle against the Stalin cult a mistake and cast aspersions on the Programme of the CPSU.

Reviving the practices and methods used by the Trotskyites, the Chinese leaders are trying to oppose the Soviet people, the Soviet Communists, the Party leaders, to the leadership of the country. Matters have reached a stage where the Chinese press and radio are calling upon Soviet people to oppose the CC CPSU and the Soviet Government.

What is this? A struggle for the "purity" of Marxism-Leninism? No. It signifies a complete renunciation of elementary norms of relations between Communist parties, a renunciation of Marxist-Leninist principles of relations between socialist countries, a transition to positions of undisguised anti-Sovietism.

The leaders of the CPC no longer limit themselves to action in the sphere of ideology. They have transferred ideological differences to inter-state relations, to the sphere of the practical political line of the socialist countries and the communist parties. Seeking to weaken the unity and solidarity of the socialist commonwealth, the CPC leaders are resorting to all sorts of manoeuvres and dodges in order to undermine the economic and political relations between the socialist countries and disorganise their actions in the international arena. Recently the Chinese leaders have sharply intensified their splitting, undermining activities in the

world communist movement. There is now no longer any doubt that Peking is steering a course towards a split among the communist parties, towards the setting up of factions and groups hostile to Marxism-Leninism.

Such, comrades, is the actual situation that has taken shape in the communist movement as a result of the splitting activities of the CPC leadership.

In an effort to screen their departure from Marxism-Leninism, the Chinese leaders have recently become more active in their manoeuvres, masking their objectives and designs and harping importunately on their "revolutionism", "courage", "determination" and so forth. But the farther events develop, the more hysterical is the tone of Chinese propaganda and the more evident it is becoming that the real plans of the Chinese leadership have nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism, with the interests of world socialism. It is becoming increasingly clear that under the mask of ultra-revolutionary verbiage and slogans, the CPC leadership are now savagely attacking the gains of world socialism, concentrating their main fire not against the imperialists but primarily against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

True, the Chinese leaders continue to say a lot about their striving for unity and solidarity in the socialist commonwealth. But their deeds completely diverge from these words.

They harp on unity, but all their actions have a different purpose, that of disorganising and splitting the socialist camp, undermining the ideological foundations and organisational and political principles that rally and unite the peoples of the socialist commonwealth. They want to impose upon the socialist countries a "Sinified socialism", an adventurist line in foreign and domestic policy, and the personality cult ideology and practices.

The Chinese leaders keep harping on their desire to "strengthen" the international communist movement, to "purge" it of "modern revisionism" and unite it on a "new foundation". But the real aim of the CPC leadership is to split the united communist front, oppose the communist movement with a bloc of pro-Chinese factions and groups, and subordinate the communist parties to their influence, using all sorts of political apostates—renegades of communism, anarchists, Trotskyites and so on.

The Chinese leaders prattle about their being the most reliable and tested friends of the national liberation movement. But whoever believes this will be sadly disillusioned. The target of the CPC leadership is to impose their adventurist concepts and methods upon the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, to counterpoise the peoples on racial grounds, and disrupt the alliance between the national liberation and the working-class movement, which can only disorganise and weaken the national liberation movement.

Lately the Chinese leaders have been claiming that they are the true champions of peace and consistent advocates of peaceful coexistence between states with different social and economic systems. But who will believe them? Their provocatory stand during the Caribbean crisis, their refusal to sign the Moscow partial nuclear test ban treaty, and their ceaseless efforts to slander the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union have shown the whole world their reluctance to work for relaxation of world tension and their desire to preserve the "cold war" as a suitable background for an adventurist policy.

All the arguments that the leaders of the CC CPC so eagerly put forward about the interests of the world revolution and about the liberation struggle of the peoples are, in effect, designed to screen from world public opinion, from Communists, the principal strategic line of subordinating at all costs the communist and national liberation movement to their great-power, egoistical interests. For the sake of this the principles of proletarian internationalism are being flagrantly trampled. To this end Marxist-Leninist teaching is reshaped and distorted and use is made of the worst traditions of petty-bourgeois nationalism and the most unscrupulous demagogy and slander.

In view of the splitting stand taken by the CPC leadership and their increasing attempts to disorganise the international communist and working-class movement there is a pressing need for a deeper analysis of what led the Chinese theoreticians astray and what the splitting activity of the CPC leadership may result in.

I

TWO APPROACHES TO THE PROBLEM OF THE ROLE OF THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM

The radical changes that took place in the world after the Second World War are linked up chiefly with the rise and development of a world system of socialism. The countries of the socialist commonwealth are the main bulwark of all the revolutionary forces of modern times, a reliable champion of world peace. The struggle between world socialism and world imperialism is the principal content of our epoch, the pivot of the class struggle on a world scale.

There was a time when the Chinese leaders subscribed to this major proposition of Marxism-Leninism. Lately, however, the CPC leadership have been setting the national liberation movement off against the socialist system and the working-class movement in the capitalist countries, proclaiming it as the main force in the struggle against imperialism and undermining the unity of the revolutionary forces of modern times. In its letter of June 14, 1963, the CC CPC makes the claim that the "vast regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America" are the centre of the contradictions of the modern world, "the chief zone of the storms of the world revolution".

An editorial carried by **Jenminjihpao** and **Hungchi** on October 22, 1963, states: "The national liberation revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America is now becoming the most important force that is dealing a direct blow at imperialism".

This clearly revises the Marxist teaching on the historical role of the working class and belittles the working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries. As regards the world socialist system, the Chinese theoreticians apportion to it only the role of a "strong point" to support and develop the revolution of the oppressed nations and peoples of the whole world. It goes without saying that this stand can only harm both the socialist system and the national liberation movement, the great cause of the struggle of the international proletariat.

According to the views of the Chinese theoreticians, the world socialist system not only fails to exert an increasingly decisive influence on the entire course of world development but does not even play an independent role in the revolutionary struggle of the masses against imperialism.

This interpretation of the role and significance of the world socialist system does not conform with the actual balance of forces in the world and runs counter to the conclusions drawn by the fraternal parties in their Statement of 1960.

The idea that modern world development is based on the contradiction between socialism and capitalism belongs to Lenin. He wrote: "... the relations between peoples, the entire world system of states are determined by the struggle of a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia. If we lose sight of that we shall be unable correctly to formulate a single national or colonial question, even if it concerned the most remote corner of the world. Only by proceeding from this standpoint can the communist parties correctly formulate and resolve political problems both in the civilised and in the backward countries." (**Collected Works**, Vol. 31, p. 216, Russ. ed.)

This was written during the early years of Soviet power. In our day, when instead of only one socialist country there is a mighty socialist camp, its influence on "the relations between peoples", on "the entire world system of states" and, in the final analysis, on the world revolutionary process has grown tremendously.

Attaching the utmost significance to the national liberation movement, Marxists-Leninists at the same time hold that the main content, the main trend and the main features of the historical development of human society in the modern epoch are determined by the world socialist system, by the forces struggling against imperialism, for the socialist reorganisation of society. The most organised class forces, primarily the bulk of the working class, the most advanced class of modern society which, as our teachers—Marx, Engels and Lenin—pointed out, is the gravedigger of capitalism, are concentrated namely in this bridgehead.

The prime role in the world revolutionary process is played by the socialist countries. This is seen firstly in

the fact that the working class, the working people of these countries are successfully resolving social problems and building a new society where oppression and exploitation are unknown and for which the peoples are taking the road of revolution. By creating the material and technical basis of socialism and communism, the socialist countries are inflicting one blow after another on imperialism in the decisive sphere of human activity, in the sphere of material production. When the workers and peasants in the capitalist countries see the achievements of the socialist states in economic development, in raising the standard of living, in promoting democracy and in drawing the masses into state administration they become convinced in practice that the basic requirements of working people can be satisfied only on the road of socialism. All this infuses the masses with a revolutionary spirit and helps to draw them into an active struggle against the capitalist system, for social and national liberation.

Secondly, the farther we progress the greater becomes the role of the socialist states as a force directly opposing the aggressive counter-revolutionary designs of imperialism. Under conditions where the might of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist commonwealth holds the main forces of international reaction and aggression in check the working masses and peoples of the colonial countries have the most favourable opportunity for waging a struggle against imperialism and internal reaction. People who followed the development of international events in the post-war years could not fail to see that there is an extremely close link between the successes of the revolutionary struggle in the capitalist countries, the victories of the national liberation movement and the growth of the might of the world socialist system.

Victory over capitalism on a world scale can be achieved solely through the joint efforts of the world socialist system, the working class movement and the national liberation struggle of the peoples. Each of these forces makes its own contribution to the anti-imperialist struggle. However, one cannot fail to see that the struggle of the world socialist system against imperialism is the focal point of world policy, of the whole of social development.

The Marxists-Leninists can have no doubt as to the primary, increasingly decisive role which the world socialist system plays, and has to play, in bringing about the triumph of the new social system all over the globe. The historical mission of the socialist countries is determined by the objective laws of social development, by the irrefutable fact that the countries in which socialism has triumphed are today in the van not only of the socialist forces, but of the progressive forces of the world. They are not only a beacon lighting up mankind's road to social progress but a powerful material force embodying Marxist-Leninist ideas, a force which is fighting capitalism and is bound to defeat it in the decisive sphere of human activity, the sphere of material production.

All the facts indicate that the socialist countries can within a historically short time surpass the capitalist countries economically as well. Let us recall that total industrial output in the socialist countries in 1962 was roughly eight times as great as it had been on their territory in 1937, whereas the capitalist countries registered only a 2.6-fold increase. The world socialist system has now attained a new stage in the economic competition with capitalism. In 1950 the socialist countries' share in world industrial production was about one-fifth; today it exceeds one-third.

It is the internationalist duty of the Communists of the socialist countries to continue effectively building the new society, promoting their economy and strengthening their defences, consolidating the socialist community, and to strive to ensure that socialist ideas exercise an increasing appeal to the working people as they are translated into reality. Nowadays the merits of socialism are judged not only by theoretical writings, but, above all, by what is done in practice, by the way in which Communists actually solve the problems of building the new society. If we accomplish this task properly, we shall greatly promote the struggle for socialism in other countries, and if we don't, it will be a blow to that struggle.

What is the attitude of the CPC leadership towards Lenin's conclusion that socialist countries influence the development of the world revolution mainly by their economic achievements? Do the CPC leaders stand for peaceful economic competition?

The CPC leadership, misrepresenting the issue, argues that economic competition means that "the oppressed

peoples and nations have no need at all to fight and to rise in revolt" and that "they have merely to wait quietly until the Soviet Union outstrips the most developed capitalist country in level of production and standard of living...".

It would never occur to a Marxist-Leninist, however, to affirm that peaceful economic competition "can take the place of the struggle of the peoples of different countries for their emancipation," or that the achievements of socialism in economic competition will lead to the "automatic" collapse of capitalism and release the peoples from the necessity of waging class and national liberation struggles. Peking is putting about these false ideas with the express aim of discrediting the idea of economic competition between the two systems. The fact is that the Marxists-Leninists see the revolutionising effect of the victories of socialism in economic competition precisely in the fact that these victories stimulate the class struggle of the working people and make them politically conscious fighters for socialism. Peaceful economic competition, far from dooming the people to waiting passively, arouses their revolutionary activity. This is fully realised by the imperialists, who dread progress in the socialist countries and try to hold up that progress.

You will observe, comrades, that the issue of peaceful economic competition is far from being merely an economic issue. It also has profound political significance, for to defeat capitalism economically means making it much easier for all revolutionary forces to fight against imperialism. And this is a political issue.

Our Party regards it as its chief task to build up the economic and defence potential of the Soviet Union and the world socialist commonwealth as a whole, and to increase its influence on the entire revolutionary process. We shall continue steadily and consistently to press forward our policy of carrying out the Programme of the CPSU for the construction of communism, the most just of social systems, in our country. Communist construction is a tremendous contribution to the fulfilment of the Soviet people's internationalist duty. This road was charted by the great Lenin. Nothing and no one can ever divert us from the Leninist road.

To win the economic competition with capitalism, the socialist countries must make proper use of the advantages of socialism, both in each country and throughout the world socialist system. In practice, this implies a considerable expansion of political as well as mutually beneficial economic relations between socialist countries, and the promotion of cultural, scientific and technical co-operation among them. It is in this direction that the activities of the CPSU and other fraternal parties have been developing.

By contrast, the Chinese leaders have in recent years shown that they have no interest in strengthening the unity of the world socialist system. The CPR has not only stopped co-ordinating its actions with other socialist countries, but is openly combating the agreed line of the socialist countries in the world arena. The Chinese leadership has openly set out to shake the foundations of the socialist community and to abolish economic relations with socialist countries, particularly with the Comecon countries and above all the Soviet Union. In 1962 the CPR's trade with the Comecon countries decreased 2.8 times compared with 1959, and in 1963 it dropped by almost another 20 per cent.

The Chinese leaders' propaganda shows that they are frankly bent on discrediting economic relations between the socialist countries belonging to Comecon, which evidently meets their disruptive aims. Trying to sow discord among the socialist countries, the Chinese leaders do not stick at using lies and slander dished up by imperialist propaganda. No sooner does the bourgeois press carry a falsehood about the Soviet Union or some other socialist country than Chinese propaganda seizes on the calumny.

The Communist parties of the socialist countries, in doing away with the effects of the personality cult, have cleared the ground for closer relations between fraternal countries on the basis of the Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism. It is well known that a necessary condition for the development of the socialist system as whole is to promote the independence and sovereignty of each socialist country. Failing this there can be no truly voluntary and solid union of nations. Fraternal parties reacted to the line adopted by the Twentieth Congress

of the CPSU as the only correct, Leninist direction in which to develop relations between the socialist countries.

The Chinese leaders do not like that line, however. All indications are that they would like to be able to give orders in the socialist commonwealth as in their own estate, to impose their will on other countries, and to dictate the terms on which they would either admit whole parties and peoples into the socialist system or "excommunicate" them from it at will.

Take, for example, the CPC leaders' attitude towards Yugoslavia. As late as 1955-56 the Chinese leadership spoke highly of the progress of socialist construction in the FPRY. In the autumn of 1957, **Jenminjihpao** wrote, in an article devoted to Chinese-Yugoslav friendship: "The peoples of our countries are advancing along the socialist road." The same newspaper stated: "...Yugoslavia has made great progress in socialist construction." This was how people in China spoke of the nature of the sociopolitical system in Yugoslavia a mere five or six years ago. Today they say and write something entirely different about Yugoslavia. **Jenminjihpao** now alleges that in Yugoslavia "there exists a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie; indeed, it not only exists but is the most barbarous fascist dictatorship," and that Yugoslavia is a "counter-revolutionary special force of US imperialism..."

The question arises: what has happened in Yugoslavia? What facts, what actual developments in the socio-economic and political life of that country, have entitled Chinese theoreticians to reverse their estimations so abruptly? There are no such facts or developments, and there haven't been any. Anyone who proceeds not from a subjective standpoint, but from objective laws, from the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, must admit that Yugoslavia is a socialist country and that, moreover, the positions of socialism are going from strength to strength in Yugoslavia. Indeed, while in 1958 the socialist sector comprised 100% in industry, 6% in agriculture and 97% in trade, today, a few years after the Chinese press has praised Yugoslavia's achievements in socialist construction, the socialist sector is still 100% in the country's industry, as much as 15% (instead of 6%) in agriculture and 100% (instead of 97%) in trade. All these facts go to show that the Yugoslav economy is developing as a socialist economy.

Anyone who does not take white for black but looks at things objectively, is bound to see that Yugoslavia, in the international arena, too, supports the socialist countries' fight for world peace and peaceful coexistence, general and complete disarmament, the prohibition of nuclear weapons, the restoration of the legitimate rights of the CPR in the UN, and so on.

Why, then, do the Chinese leaders shut their eyes to all these facts? Why do they now insult the heroic Yugoslav people by calling Yugoslavia a fascist country? We have put this question to the Chinese leaders on more than one occasion but have never heard from them anything like a coherent answer.

The Chinese leaders quote the 1960 Statement of fraternal parties, which said that the revolutionary gains in Yugoslavia were imperilled by the errors of the LCY. Let us note, however, that from what the Statement says, it did not deny even then but, on the contrary, confirmed the existence of definite revolutionary, socialist achievements in Yugoslavia and that, secondly, later years showed the positions of socialism to have become much stronger in Yugoslavia, a development which we certainly welcome.

While striving to improve relations with Yugoslavia, and being firmly convinced that this meets the interests of the socialist cause, we Soviet Communists do not at all conceal the ideological differences which persist between the Communist movement and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. We have said as much to the Yugoslav comrades. But we maintain that the existence of differences is by no means a reason for "excommunicating" Yugoslavia from socialism. One cannot arbitrarily, acting on a subjective impulse and, furthermore, doctoring and distorting the facts, permit or forbid this or that people to build socialism. And yet this is precisely what the Chinese leaders are trying to do.

The Yugoslav example brings out with particular clarity the Chinese leaders' claim to the role of "supreme arbiters" in the socialist community who should judge which country is socialist and which isn't. Today they have, in defiance of the facts, "excommunicated" Yugoslavia from socialism. Tomorrow it may occur to the CPC

leadership to do as much with regard to other socialist countries. But what has this subjectivist and arbitrary approach to do with Marxism-Leninism? This is a method fit only for those who set at nothing the interests of the unity and solidarity of the socialist countries.

Or take the so-called Albanian question, of which the CC membership and our Party as a whole have been repeatedly informed. It is well known that from 1960 on, the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour abruptly changed their political line, although we did not give them any cause to do so, and embarked on hostile actions against the CPSU and other fraternal parties. The government of the People's Republic of Albania has virtually broken off political, economic and military co-operation with the Soviet Union and most of the other socialist countries.

In was hard to see at first what had prompted Hoxha's and Shehu's anti-Soviet moves. But as time wore on it became more and more obvious that the Albanian leaders took their cue from someone else, for they repeated word for word what was said or written in Peking.

The Sino-Albanian alliance is no accidental development. It arose on the basis of opposition to the Leninist line of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, on the basis of a hostile attitude towards the elimination of the effects of the Stalin personality cult. Just as in the case of China, the Albanian leaders' defence of the personality cult is due to the fact that over many years they have themselves been implanting the personality cult and using pernicious methods of leadership in Party and country.

At the Third Congress of the APL, in 1956, the Albanian leaders, finding themselves under pressure from the Party membership, who after the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU had demanded that the suffocating atmosphere of the personality cult be removed and the Leninist standards of Party life re-established in the APL, had to admit publicly that the personality cult in the APL had become "marked". But this "admission" and the promise to end the personality cult were no more than a stratagem. As a matter of fact, the Albanian leaders had no intention at all of renouncing their harmful practices. Just when Hoxha was doing "self-criticism" from the rostrum of the Third Congress, the Albanian authorities were busy putting in

jail or sending into exile members of the Tirana Party organisation who at the city Party conference had criticised the Albanian leaders for violating the Leninist standards of Party life, for arbitrary practices and for the persecution of honest Communists.

Hoxha and Shehu combated the line of the Twentieth Congress because they were afraid of losing their posts, because the establishment of the Leninist standards of Party life in the APL would have ended their arbitrary rule. The Albanian leaders, in taking an anti-Soviet road, put their people in a trying position. They created in Albania difficulties that would have been out of the question given normal co-operation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Soviet people are confident that in spite of the present difficulties in Soviet-Albanian relations, caused by the policy of the Albanian top leaders, the peoples of our two countries will advance together to the common goal, the triumph of socialism and communism. As far as the CPSU is concerned, we are willing, as in the past, to take all necessary steps in this direction.

The CPSU regards it as one of its major tasks to work for the close unity of the world socialist system, for close fraternal relations with all the socialist countries on the basis of complete equality and voluntary co-operation, for the increased solidarity of the socialist countries with the aim of waging a joint struggle against the imperialist aggressors, for world peace, for the complete triumph of communism.

II

QUESTIONS OF WAR, PEACE AND REVOLUTION

Comrades, the destinies of our great cause, and of the peoples, depend in decisive measure on the Communist movement being given correct strategic and tactical directives on questions of war, peace and revolution. It is particularly important to take account of the interconnection and interdependence of these questions today, when the revolutionary achievements of each particular country are so directly bound up with the development of the in-

ternational situation as a whole, with the world revolutionary process, as never before.

The Marxist-Leninist parties see their consistent struggle for peace as fulfilment of their historical mission towards mankind, which is to prevent the extermination of peoples in the flames of a thermonuclear war. Furthermore, they see it as a most important condition for the successful construction of socialism and communism and for the expansion of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat of the capitalist countries and of the liberation movement of the peoples oppressed by imperialism.

An all-round analysis of the balance of world forces enabled the Communist and Workers' Parties to draw the cardinal conclusion that world war can be averted even before socialism triumphs throughout the world, and to re-emphasise that the Leninist principle of the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems is the unshakable basis for the foreign policy of the socialist countries.

As we know, these propositions were laid down in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement adopted in Moscow. The experience of recent years, far from shaking the vital necessity of the policy of peaceful coexistence, has, in fact, fully borne it out. It is due to the socialist countries' consistent implementation of this policy, which is supported by hundreds of millions of people all over the world, that we have been able to foil the imperialist reactionaries' schemes against peace. The blessings of peace which mankind enjoys today do not come from the gods. They are a concrete result of the staunch resistance of the peace forces to attempts to unleash a thermonuclear war, a result of the growing power of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, as well as of the correct policy of the Communist parties, which have raised aloft the banner of the struggle for peace and rallied the whole of progressive mankind to this banner.

The Chinese leaders, who engaged first in a controversy with the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties, and then in a political fight against them, showed especial zeal in attacking the conclusions of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, and the theses of the Moscow meetings of fraternal parties, on questions of war, peace and revolution. They imagined that it was on these points that they would be able to make political capital, and with this aim in view they accused the entire Communist movement of "losing sight of revolutionary perspective" and "surrendering to the capitalists".

To impart at least a semblance of veracity to their infamous charges, the Chinese theoreticians resort to a device that is neither clever nor new. Artificially separating two aspects of a single social process from each other they contrast the fight for peace with the revolutionary movement, and claim that these two highly important tasks are mutually exclusive. From what they allege it follows that those who fight to maintain peace and ward off world war are against revolution and hamper the revolutionary struggle.

One does not require a special Marxist education to see that the CPC leaders, who pose as grandmasters of dialectics, have in fact killed dialectics, which aptly Lenin described as the "living soul" of Marxism. The Communist parties, which hold aloft the banner of the struggle for peace, are with increasing energy stepping up the class struggle of the proletariat and all working people, and the national liberation movement against imperialism.

In their fight against the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence, which they counter with the idea of giving revolution a "push" by means of war, the CPC leaders have gone as far as to assert that war is an acceptable and, in fact, the only means of settling the contradictions between capitalism and socialism. They ignore the experience of the world Communist movement and exalt the road of the victorious revolution in China as something absolute, trying to make it an incontrovertible truth for all countries and peoples. On every occasion, whether suitable or not, Chinese propaganda quotes what Mao Tse-tung said about war and peace in the thirties, during the civil war in China.

Among the widely popularised statements of Mao Tse-tung are the following: "the war to be waged by the overwhelming majority of mankind ... will become a bridge over which mankind will pass into a new era in history"; "the world can only be reorganised by means of the rifle"; "we stand for abolishing war, we have no use for it, but war can only be abolished through war. If you want rifles to go out of existence, take to the rifle."

Almost three decades have passed since those statements were made. Radical changes have occurred in the world—the world socialist system has formed and has become a mighty force, the revolutionary movement of the working class has assumed a mass scale, and the national liberation movement has scored historic victories. Today the alliance of the peace forces can, as the documents of Communist parties point out, overcome the forces of imperialism and prevent them from launching a new war. The prevention of war has become a particularly pressing task because the most destructive weapon recorded in history has been created, and has been stockpiled in such quantities that they can bring untold calamities to all nations.

The Chinese leaders refuse to take all that into consideration. Plainly showing off their irresponsible attitude, they affirm that the nuclear bomb is a "paper tiger" and in no way affects the issue of war and peace. In keeping with this logic, which runs counter to elementary common sense, Mao Tse-tung, speaking at the Moscow meeting in 1957, argued that the struggle for socialism even stood to gain from a world thermonuclear war. "Can one foresee," he said, "the number of human lives that the future war may take? It may be one-third of the 2,700 million inhabitants of the world, that is, a mere 900 million people.... I had an argument over this matter with Nehru. He is more pessimistic in this respect than I. I told him that should half of mankind be destroyed, the other half would survive; in return, imperialism would be wiped out completely and there would be only socialism in the world. In half a century or a whole century the population would grow again—even by more than half."

This concept is even more lucidly expressed in the collection of articles **Long Live Leninism!** which the CC CPC has approved and is circulating. "On the ruins of fallen imperialism," it says, "the victorious people will build a thousand times more wonderful future at an extremely rapid rate." That is the kind of ultra-revolutionary verbiage, complete political irresponsibility that is particularly dangerous because it is being demonstrated by people standing at the helm of a large socialist country.

It is common knowledge that Lenin had pointed out as far back as 1918 that a world war in which the mighty achievements of technology are used with such great energy

for the mass extermination of human life, apart from being a major crime, can also lead "to the undermining of the very foundations of human society" (**Works**, vol. 27, p. 386). In our days, with the production and the development of nuclear missile weapons, this danger has increased still more. How can people, particularly the adherents of the communist teaching, ignore this fact?

Neither the socialist countries, nor the working people want a world war; it cannot serve the cause of the triumph of socialism. The conclusion drawn by specialists on the possible consequences of another world war are quite unambiguous. For example, the progressive American scientist Linus Pauling gives figures to show that within 60 days after the outbreak of a nuclear war out of 190 million Americans 170 million will perish, 15 million will suffer greatly and only five million will remain relatively unharmed. The situation in other regions drawn directly into the sphere of military operations will evidently be the same. Moreover, account must also be taken of such delayed consequences of a nuclear war as the disorganisation of society due to the destruction of key industrial centres and of the means of transport and communication, and increasing radioactive pollution. Without mincing words, one can say that if a world thermonuclear conflict breaks out it would be the greatest tragedy for humanity and would, of course, deal the cause of communism a heavy blow.

No party that really cherishes the interests of the people can fail to appreciate its responsibility in the struggle for averting another world war. Yet the Chinese leaders, as we have seen, even boast that, allegedly for "the sake of the revolution", they are prepared to agree to the destruction of half of mankind. It does not worry them in the least that the losses in densely-populated countries that will find themselves in the centre of military operations will be so great that for entire peoples there will no longer be any question of the triumph of socialism because they will disappear from the face of the earth.

Here it would be appropriate to recall certain facts. When in a conversation with Tao Chu, member of the CC CPC, a Czechoslovak journalist mentioned that in the event of a thermonuclear war the whole of Czechoslovakia, where 14 million people live, might be destroyed, the answer he received was: "In the event of a war of annihilation the

small countries in the socialist camp will have to subordinate their interests to the common interests of the camp as a whole." Another high-ranking CPR official told Soviet representatives that Comrade Togliatti, General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party, was wrong when expressing anxiety for the fate of his people he said that if a thermonuclear war broke out the whole of Italy would be destroyed. "Other people will remain," declared this official, "and imperialism will be wiped out..."

In an effort to disprove the conclusion of the international communist movement on the possibility of averting war, in Peking it is alleged that by pursuing a policy of peaceful coexistence the CPSU and other fraternal parties proceed from a proposition that the nature of imperialism has changed, base all their calculations on the "peace-loving and humane nature of the imperialists", and "ask and beg for" peace from them. On the other hand, the CPC leaders, it is claimed, are waging a determined and relentless struggle against imperialism and exposing its aggressive nature.

But these crude falsifications and distortions can fool no one. The attempts to portray Marxists-Leninists as some kind of pacificists are simply ludicrous. In the 1957 Declaration it is recorded that as long as imperialism exists there will always be ground for aggressive wars. From this, however, the communist parties did not draw the conclusion that world war is fatally inevitable. They showed that while the nature of imperialism, its rapacious essence, remains unchanged, there has been a change in the balance of forces in the world, that imperialism now occupies a different place and role in world economy and world politics and that its influence on the course of events is diminishing. These are the main factors forcing the imperialists to comply with peaceful coexistence.

Consequently, it is not that the imperialists have become "peace-loving" or more "tractable" but that they have no alternative but to take the growing strength of socialism into account. They are aware that the Soviet Union, the socialist countries, possess a formidable weapon and are able to deal any aggressor a crushing blow. They cannot help but take into account the strength of the mighty working-class and democratic movement in the capitalist countries, and the huge scale of the national liberation struggle

of the peoples. The fact that capitalism will be wiped out and buried if the imperialist madmen unleash a world war is being more and more clearly apprehended in the camp of our class enemies.

The possibility of averting war, the threat of which is created as long as imperialism exists, does not arise of itself. It requires that the peace-loving forces display the greatest energy in the struggle for peace and show the greatest vigilance with regard to the intrigues of their enemies. It depends to a considerable extent on the policy of the socialist countries, on their defensive might, on the unswerving implementation of the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence. That is exactly the policy being pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries that firmly adhere to the positions proclaimed in the Declaration and Statement of the fraternal parties.

However, it was namely against this, the only wise policy, that the Chinese leaders have declared war. Having their own special objectives in mind, they are trying to discredit the principles of peaceful coexistence, assuring the peoples that their efforts to preserve peace are futile. Strange as it may seem, the Chinese leaders have proclaimed this point of view optimistic.

In **Long Live Leninism!** it is asserted: "Wars of one kind or another may break out as long as an end is not put to the imperialist system and the exploiter classes." "Naturally, whether or not the imperialists start a war does not in the long run depend upon us for we are not the chiefs of their general staffs." At the Peking session of the World Federation of Trade Unions in June 1960, Liu Ning-yi, member of the CC CPC, said: "The assertions about the possibility of peaceful coexistence only make the imperialists happy." At the World Peace Council session in Stockholm in December 1961, the same Liu Ning-yi made himself more plain: "Those who think agreement can be reached with the imperialists and peaceful coexistence ensured only delude themselves." It is not difficult to notice that one and the same importunate and gloomy refrain that "war cannot be averted" is repeated in all these statements.

The opposition of the Chinese leaders to the policy of peaceful coexistence is closely tied up with their stand on the question of disarmament, on international negotiations between the socialist countries and the Western powers. They

regard disarmament as an "illusion, an unrealisable slogan" that can only mislead the peoples. For example, speaking at the Peking session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions in 1960 Liu Chang-sheng, member of the CC CPC, declared: "Some people think that the disarmament proposals can be carried into effect while imperialism exists. That is an illusion that has nothing to do with reality... A world without wars and without arms is possible only in an epoch when socialism triumphs throughout the world."

It is not hard to see in these statements a desire of the Chinese leaders to distort the clear stand of the CPSU and of all the Marxist-Leninist Parties and at the same time to undermine the policy of disarmament which is an important condition in the struggle for the prevention of a new world war and for a relaxation of international tensions.

It is absurd to assert that our Party entertains any illusions concerning the military policy of the imperialist powers and their readiness to agree to general and complete disarmament. As long as imperialism exists, the reactionary forces will clutch at armaments as a last resort to retain their domination, and to use these armaments in wars, if they manage to unleash them. All this is quite obvious.

Does this, however, mean that the Communists should drop the struggle for disarmament and admit the inevitability of the arms race and of a new world war? No, such a passive stand would be contradictory to the entire revolutionary spirit of our teaching and to the vital interests of the peoples.

We are convinced that the revolutionary struggle of the working people, the general democratic upsurge, the growing might of socialism and the resolute actions of all the peace-loving forces can and should force the imperialists to comply, contrary to their desire, with the peoples' demands for disarmament. We are not fatalists, and we believe in the tremendous capacities of the popular masses. No wonder that already 70 years ago Frederick Engels called upon the Communists to fight for disarmament, and this at a time when capitalism held undivided sway in the world.

"It is 25 years already that all Europe has been arming on an unprecedented scale. Each great power endeavours to outstrip another in military might and preparedness for war. Germany, France and Russia do their utmost to surpass one another," wrote Engels in a series of articles entitled "Can Europe Disarm?" "Is it not stupid to talk of disarmament under such circumstances?" he asked, and supplied the answer to his own question: "I maintain: **disarmament, and thereby a guarantee for peace, is possible.**" (Works, Ed. 2, Vol. 22, p. 387, Russ. ed.).

That is how Engels tackled the question! Already in those days he saw the vast social forces that rise against war. Then how can one speak now of disarmament as of an "unrealisable illusion" when all progressive mankind is coming out for disarmament and when the forces of peace have the mighty support of the socialist countries?

The slogan "A World Without Arms, A World Without Wars" is for the communist parties a mighty means of cohesion and mobilisation of the popular masses for an active struggle against inveterate militarist imperialist circles. This slogan is clear to every man, regardless of his political convictions. Disarmament means the termination of the arms race and, consequently, a cut in the tax burden. It conforms to the vital interests of the broadest sections of the population. Not only the communists, but also many other social forces actively support and propagandise this slogan. Then why should we, communists, discard it? Is it not clear that the discarding of this slogan can merely weaken the influence of the communists in the popular masses, and that this would play into the hands of the reactionary forces.

Are the Chinese leaders so naive that they do not realise where their strange logic leads them to and what great responsibility they assume before the peoples of the world for their reckless theses fraught with the gravest of consequences?

The Chinese leaders, apart from holding a negative stand on such vitally important questions of international policy as disarmament, termination of nuclear weapon tests and relaxation of international tensions, also try to paralyse the efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries fighting against the threat of world war.

Facts show that time and again the CPR Government has come forward in the world arena as a force opposing the peaceful foreign policy of the socialist countries and disorganising the common anti-war front. It has happened

time and again that when the world was faced with an acute situation in which unity of action among the socialist countries and all peace-loving forces was particularly imperative, the Chinese leaders became active. But against whom? Against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries seeking a relaxation of tension. Moreover, it has been noted that Peking could not conceal its irritation and vexation every time the situation was normalised and a military conflict avoided. That was the case, for example, during the Caribbean crisis. The CPC leadership did nothing to help avert a world war and effectively support revolutionary Cuba. They did nothing to support the defensive measures of the Warsaw Treaty powers, adopted to meet possible imperialist aggression, and said nothing about China siding with the socialist countries in the event of a US attack against Cuba. It was quite evident that at a time when the Soviet Union was prepared to defend the Cuban revolution with all the means at its disposal, the Chinese leaders strove to benefit from the crisis in the Caribbean region.

It is a fact that when the Caribbean crisis was at its height the CPR Government extended the armed conflict on the Sino-Indian frontier. No matter how the Chinese leaders try belatedly to justify their behaviour at that moment they cannot escape the responsibility of the fact that by their actions they essentially helped the extreme reactionary circles of imperialism, thereby aggravating an already complicated and dangerous situation in the world.

The Sino-Indian conflict arose over the possession of frontier territories in the Himalayas which had not been disputed either by China or India in the course of many centuries. However, inasmuch as this problem arose everything should have been done to settle it peacefully, by negotiation. The Government of the USSR has repeatedly advocated namely such a settlement of this frontier dispute. However, hostilities broke out in the region of the Himalayas. The pernicious consequences of this conflict have now manifested themselves fully. It has rendered a great service to imperialism and inflicted grave harm to the national liberation movement, the progressive forces of India and the entire front of the anti-imperialist struggle. Utilising the Sino-Indian conflict for their own purposes, the imperialists and their supporters are seeking to undermine the trust

of the peoples of the young national states in the socialist countries, draw India into military blocs and strengthen the positions of extreme reaction in that country.

While allowing relations with India, which as everybody knows is not a member of military blocs, to deteriorate sharply, the Chinese leadership at the same time actually leagued together with Pakistan, a member of SEATO and CENTO, which are threatening the peace and security of the Asian peoples. It is a fact that having discarded their "revolutionary phrase-mongering", the Chinese leaders have in reality adopted a line that can hardly be dovetailed with the principled position of the countries of the socialist commonwealth with regard to imperialist blocs.

The approach of the Chinese leaders to the choice of friends and allies is strange, to say the least. How is it possible, it may be asked, to fling mud at the socialist countries, at communist parties and, at the same time, with the whole world watching, shower compliments on the reactionary regime in Pakistan? That is simply unthinkable.

Can anyone believe that the rapprochement with Pakistan has been dictated by the interests of the development of the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of Asia against imperialism that the Chinese leaders talk so much about?

The dangerous, adventurist views and propositions on questions of war and peace that the CPC leaders would like to impose upon the fraternal parties have quite understandably been categorically rejected by the international communist movement and broad circles of the world progressive public.

Not only Marxists-Leninists but also all friends of socialism and peace noted with alarm that the "bellicose" preachings from Peking practically reach the point of directly justifying and even lauding war as a means of settling social conflicts.

Hysterically attacking the Moscow partial nuclear test ban treaty on July 31, 1963, and thereby finding themselves aligned with the most aggressive circles of imperialism, the Chinese leaders still further exposed themselves as adversaries of the policy of peace and peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The enemies rejoiced over it and friends could not but condemn it.

The Chinese leaders felt that they had gone too far and in order to extricate themselves from this situation they

made a complete volte-face in their propaganda. Lately a stream of "peace-loving" statements suddenly gushed from Peking, while representatives of the Chinese Government hasten to sign documents concerning the struggle for peace and fidelity to the policy of peaceful coexistence. Such was the vein of many of the statements made by Chou En-lai during his tour in Africa and Asia.

"World war cannot be averted," they were saying plainly in Peking only yesterday. Today they are trying to persuade people to believe that the thesis on the averting of war was put forward by none other than the leaders of the CPC. Yesterday they abused peaceful coexistence, today they are posing as practically its only and the most zealous supporters. Yesterday they declared that disarmament was a deception of the peoples, today they sign statements in which they undertake to work for disarmament.

This volte-face could only be welcomed if there had been signs that the CPC leadership really perceives its mistakes and is taking a correct stand. Regretfully everything points to the fact that the aims and objectives of the Chinese leaders have not changed. Their "love of peace" is nothing but an ostentatious screen masking their real intentions, which have received a rebuff and been censured by world public opinion. One cannot fail to see that the "love of peace" now emanating from Peking is in glaring contrast to actual deeds, to the concrete policy of the Government of the CPR.

The obviously adventurist position of the CPC leaders makes itself felt in their attitude to the question of nuclear weapons.

It is well known that the CPR leaders insistently sought to obtain the atomic bombs from the Soviet Union. They expressed their deep mortification when our country did not give them samples of nuclear weapons.

The CC CPSU and the Soviet Government have already explained why we consider it inexpedient to help China produce nuclear weapons. The inevitable reaction to this would be the nuclear arming of powers of the imperialist camp, in particular, West Germany and Japan. Having a higher level of economic, scientific and technical development they could undoubtedly produce more bombs than China and build up a nuclear potential much faster. It must be borne in mind that revanchist aspirations are particularly strong in these countries. These are the countries which in the past have been the main hotbeds of military threats and militarism.

The Soviet Union's atomic weapon is a reliable guarantee of the defence not only of our country but also of the entire socialist camp, including China. The leaders of the CPR are well aware of this fact. Nonetheless, they are out to put their hands on the nuclear weapon at all costs. Very indicative in this light is the interview given to Japanese journalist in October 1963 by Chen Yi, member of the Politbureau of the CC CPC and Deputy Premier of the CPR. Saying that China would create her own nuclear weapon whatever the price, he declared, as was reported in the Japanese press, that possibly it would take China several years and perhaps even longer than that to begin the mass production of bombs. But China, he said, would produce the most modern weapon even if it would cost them their last shirt. And several days later a statement by a Chinese government spokesman, published in **Jenminjihpao**, stated that China would adhere to this line "even if the Chinese people will not be able to create an atomic bomb in a hundred years..."

It thus turns out that the possession of an atomic bomb, which the Chinese leaders call a "paper tiger", is their cherished goal.

In a fit of irritation, the CPC leaders went so far as to say that the threat of a nuclear war comes not from imperialism but from the "modern revisionists", unambiguously hinting at the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. In a speech in Pjongyang on September 18, 1963, Liu Shao-chi, Chairman of the CPR, stated: "Imperialism did not use the nuclear weapon everywhere and at will and would not dare to do so." He followed this up with the wild assertion that "in agreement with the imperialists" the Soviet Union "has monopolised the nuclear weapon" and organises "nuclear blackmail with regard to the peoples of the socialist countries and the revolutionary peoples of the whole world". If the "modern revisionists," he pathetically exclaimed, "come to use the nuclear weapon first and thereby provoke a world nuclear war they will earn the stern condemnation of the peoples of the whole world."

What touching concern Liu Shao-chi shows to lull suspicion that the imperialists have any intention of unleash-

ing a nuclear war. After this, is it not hypocrisy on the part of the CPC leadership to call for an "adherence to the class approach", for "distinguishing friend from foe", for a struggle against US imperialism as the chief enemy of peace? In this connection one cannot help but recall the perfidious rule of bourgeois diplomacy, which Palmerston expounded as "we have neither eternal allies nor eternal friends. Only our interests are eternal." All this shows how little significance the Chinese leaders attach to their own statements concerning the aggressive nature of imperialism and their uncompromising attitude to class enemies.

The following example of the discrepancy between what the Chinese leaders say and do must also be pointed out. This concerns the relations between the socialist countries and the countries of the capitalist world. Here the Chinese leaders have two yardsticks: one for appraising the policy of the USSR and other socialist countries and the other for assessing China's foreign policy. Everyone knows the sharply negative reaction of the Chinese leaders to the efforts the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are making to normalise and improve economic and other relations with the capitalist countries, including the United States of America. Why, one involuntarily asks, does any normalisation of relations between the USSR and the USA, the two great nuclear powers on whose efforts a relaxation of international tension largely depends, evoke such opposition from the Chinese Government? With a doggedness worthy of better application, the Chinese leaders do their utmost to hinder an improvement of US-Soviet relations, portraying it as a "conspiracy with the imperialists". At the same time the CPR Government is making feverish efforts to establish relations with Britain, France, Japan, West Germany and Italy. All the indications are that they would not have spurned an improvement in relations with the USA but for the fact that so far they do not see the appropriate conditions for this.

Never before has Peking received so many businessmen, political leaders and statesmen from the capitalist countries as now. CPR representatives have talks with them and sign agreements on trade, credits, scientific and technical aid and even on political issues.

Do we want to reproach the CPC leaders for this activity? Of course, not. It is a normal and intrinsic element

of the policy of peaceful coexistence. All socialist countries ultimately have to have contacts with people from the bourgeois states and not only with friends but also with representatives of the ruling imperialist circles. But the thing is that the Chinese leaders consider that when they themselves develop such activity it is an expression of the policy of real "revolutionaries", but when other socialist states do the same thing it is "revisionism" and "treachery"

But the attempts to slander our peaceloving foreign policy will inevitably collapse. Our Party shall continue to wage a struggle to avert a world thermonuclear war, secure lasting world peace and perseveringly pursue the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. Our peaceful policy, Lenin said, is approved by the overwhelming majority of the world's population. Peace helps to strengthen socialism. The working people of *all* countries, of all continents desire peace. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has won deserved glory as the banner-bearer of peace and shall always remain faithful to this banner.

The course of events has shown that the programme of struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism as drawn up by the Moscow Meetings is the programme which closely links up the immediate and end goals of the working class and ensures the advance of the world revolution.

At the same time, far from facilitating the development of the world revolutionary process, the theoretical platform and, chiefly, the practical activity of the CPC leadership create additional difficulties for the realisation of the age-old aspirations of the peoples, who are hungering for peace and social progress.

It is absurd to set the struggle for peace, for the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems off against the revolutionary class struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries and the national liberation struggle of the peoples. For Marxists-Leninists there neither is nor can be a dilemma of whether to wage a struggle for peace or a revolutionary struggle. These struggles are interrelated and are, in the final analysis, spearheaded against imperialism. The struggle for peace is one of the main forms of the struggle of the peoples against imperialism,

against the new wars being prepared by them, against the aggressive acts of the imperialists in the colonial countries, against the military bases of the imperialists on the territory of other countries, against the arms race, and so on. Does this struggle not express the vital interests of the working class and all working people?

We know that peace is a true ally of socialism. The situation created by peaceful coexistence also favourably influences the development of the national liberation movement and the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries.

The scale of the working class movement has grown immeasurably in recent years. Experience shows that in many countries the struggle of the working class for democratic and social rights is closely intertwined with the struggle for peace, against the forces of militarism. In the struggle against militarism a political complexion is imparted even to the economic actions of the working class. The efforts of the working class and all working people to avert the threat of another world war help to educate the peoples in a spirit of international solidarity because under present-day conditions, as never before, the struggle for peace is essentially an international struggle.

What, for example, does it signify to work for peace in a country like the Federal Republic of Germany? It signifies firstly opposition to the big monopolies, which are hatching ideas of revenge, opposition to their offensive against the vital rights and political freedoms of the working people. By participating in this struggle, the working class, far from "dissolving" in the mass democratic movement, as the Chinese leaders maintain, acquires experience in revolutionary organisation and discipline, unites its ranks and wins greater influence among the masses.

Naturally, being a general-democratic movement the struggle for peace neither sets itself nor can set itself the task of socialist transformations. This, incidentally, is what the CPC leaders, who are trying to foist on the peace movement tasks alien to it, fail to comprehend. But the struggle for peace is working for socialism inasmuch as it is waged against imperialism, the source of the war threat, inasmuch as it awakens in the masses a clear understanding of their vital interests.

The repudiation of this extremely close bond between the struggle for peace and the struggle for socialism reveals the essentially profound distrust that the CPC leaders have for the popular masses, for their ability to take organised action in the class struggle. The essence of the CPC leadership's present concepts of the problem of revolution consists in the rejection of the Leninist teaching of the socialist revolution as being the result of a mass struggle by the people, in relying solely on armed uprisings everywhere and in all cases without taking into account the sentiments of the masses, their preparedness for revolution, without taking into account the internal and external situation.

The immense harm of this line lies in the fact that it rejects painstaking and patient work with the masses and reliance on the maturing of the objective and subjective conditions for a socialist revolution in favour of revolutionary phrase-mongering, or, what is still worse, in favour of adventurist actions by a handful of men who are cut off from the people. Does this kind of action have anything in common with Marxism-Leninism and is this not the popularisation of Blanquist and Trotskyite ideas that have been rejected long ago?

No matter what the CPC leaders say to the contrary, one of the most acute points of the polemics in the communist movement is the problem of "the ways of carrying out the revolution" and not in the dilemma of "whether to carry or not to carry on the revolution". If the communist parties pin all their hopes solely on an armed struggle without taking into consideration the preparedness of the masses to support such a struggle it will inevitably lead only to bitter failures.

In other words, the Chinese leaders have forgotten one of the prime propositions of Marxist-Leninist theory, namely that the revolution cannot be accelerated or made to order, that it cannot be pushed on from without. "Some people," Lenin said, "think that the revolution can be effected in a foreign country by order, under an agreement. People who think in such terms are either madmen or agents provocateurs." (Coll. Works, Vol. 27, p. 441). Revolution is made by the masses headed by the proletariat and its revolutionary vanguard. Naturally, this does not in any way imply that Marxists-Leninists must passively wait for a favourable situation to arise. The experience of the

CPSU shows that even a relatively small, steeled party that has the support of the proletariat and the advanced section of the peasantry can head the revolution and lead the people. But for this, as Lenin repeatedly emphasised, there must be a revolutionary situation in which the "upper ranks" are no longer able to govern and the "lower ranks" no longer want to live as before.

Realistically assessing the present situation, the fraternal parties allow for the possibility of transition from capitalism to socialism either by peaceful or non-peaceful means.

However, no matter how the transition from capitalism to socialism is achieved, it is possible solely through a socialist revolution, through a dictatorship of the proletariat in its various forms. In each separate country the real possibility for a peaceful or non-peaceful transition to socialism is determined by concrete historical conditions. The fraternal parties in the capitalist countries are invariably guided by Lenin's proposition that the working class must master all forms and means of revolutionary struggle without exception, that it must be prepared for the swiftest and most unexpected switch from one form of struggle to another and utilise it in conformity with the obtaning situation. But the Chinese leaders oppose this creative approach to questions of tactics by the fraternal parties and attempt to instruct them from Peking on how and when to carry out a revolution in their countries. Quite understandably these "instructions" are getting a unanimous rebuff from Marxists-Leninists.

Our Party has always unswervingly adhered to positions of proletarian internationalism. No slander and no dirty fabrications can smear the banner of proletarian internationalism which is sacred to us. Our Party will continue tirelessly to strengthen its solidarity with the working class, with the working masses of the capitalist countries, struggling to destroy the capitalist system and transforming society on socialist lines. This road has been bequeathed to us by Lenin and we shall steadfastly follow it.

III

THE CPC LEADERS' POLICY OF ISOLATING THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT FROM THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING CLASS

The Chinese leaders pin special hopes on using the national liberation movement for their own ends.

The collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, and the tasks and prospects of the newly-free countries constitute one of the cardinal problems of the social progress of all mankind. Imperialism and internal reaction are trying to stop the development of national liberation revolutions and to push the newly-free countries into the trap of neo-colonialism. The progressive democratic forces are fighting for complete national freedom, for the transition to the non-capitalist path of development. The historical destinies of hundreds upon hundreds of millions of people depend on the outcome of this struggle.

The Communist parties of the world, after generalising at their international conferences the vast experience of the anti-imperialist movement, put forward a clear-cut programme of action to promote the struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for complete national and social liberation.

The Chinese leaders countered this Marxist-Leninist programme with their special policy, and are trying to impose upon the national liberation movement principles which may push it on to a perilous path and endanger the achievements of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It is particularly typical of the Chinese leaders that they completely ignore the immense variety of conditions in which the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are. It is well known that these countries stand at different levels of socio-economic and political development. One group of countries has already taken the socialist road. Another group has won political independence and set about effecting radical social reforms. A third group of countries, where the national bourgeoisie has come to power, adheres on the whole to an anti-imperialist position. There are countries which have formally acquired political independence but have virtually failed to become indepen-

dent because of the puppet regimes that have come to power in them or because of their participation in imperialist blocs. Lastly, there are countries where colonial regimes remain and whose peoples are waging a heroic struggle for their freedom.

It is obvious to the Marxists-Leninists that the peoples of each of those groups of countries are faced with different tasks. The Chinese leaders, however, are trying to impose uniform standard patterns and methods of struggle on the Communist parties and all progressive forces. This is particularly evident from what they contend to be the main tasks of the national liberation movement at the present stage.

The Marxists-Leninists consider that the main tasks of the former colonies where the political rule of the imperialists is done with—and those countries constitute a majority—are to strengthen the independence achieved, uproot colonial practices in their economy and develop it at a fast rate, achieve economic sovereignty, and follow the road to social and economic progress. Among the primary general national problems are the expulsion of foreign monopolies, the implementation of agrarian reforms in the interests of the peasants, the promotion of national industry, above all by setting up a state sector, and the democratisation of social and political life. In a number of countries, conditions are already being created, as these tasks are fulfilled, for development along non-capitalist lines, for taking the socialist road.

In their interviews with delegations from the Communist parties of newly-free countries, and in their statements at world conferences, Chinese representatives speak of nothing but the necessity for waging an armed struggle in those countries. At the Stockholm session of the World Peace Council, for examlpe, Liu Ning-yi, member of the CC CPC, claimed that "the road of armed struggle is the road to the complete liberation of the oppressed nations".

The Marxists-Leninists have always supported armed risings against the colonialists, against tyrannical regimes; they have supported the liberation wars of oppressed peoples. But they have always opposed standard tactics based on the dogmatic use of some one form of struggle, irrespective of the actual conditions. Such tactics are particularly harmful now that in most of the Asian, African and Latin

American countries national governments have come to power that are pursuing an anti-imperialist policy. In these circumstances, to advance the slogan of armed struggle as a universal method means causing double harm, disorienting the forces of national liberation and distracting them from the struggle against imperialism.

After all, it is absurd to say that the working people of Algeria, Ghana, Mali and certain other countries are faced with the task of starting an armed revolt. Such an idea amounts to an appeal to back the reactionaries, who are intent on overthrowing the governments of those countries. And what else but harm can one expect from an attempt to put this idea into effect in such countries as, for example, Indonesia or Ceylon?

The "Leftist" recommendations of the Chinese leaders for an armed struggle everywhere are nothing but an attempt to push the Communist and all democratic forces in the newly-free countries on to a path of adventures. Experience shows that those who blindly follow such recommendations, refusing to take account of the actual conditions, doom themselves to isolation, make useless sacrifices and, far from promoting social progress in their countries, handicap it.

In the question of the prospects of the historical development of the liberated countries the Chinese leaders come out against such cardinal principles of the communist movement as Lenin's thesis on the possibility of a non-capitalist way of development of the liberated countries.

Speaking at the Moscow bilateral meeting in July 1963, Teng Hsiao-ping, General Secretary of the CC CPC, said outright that the thesis of the non-capitalist path was "meaningless talk", although every Communist knows that this thesis was put forward by Lenin and has been borne out by the experience of a number of peoples that in the past were colonial.

The idea of the non-capitalist path is gaining ground among the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and for a number of peoples it has become a call for practical action. This is a tremendous achievement of socialism. Capitalism has discredited itself in the eyes of the peoples, and the appeal of socialist ideas in the newly-free countries is so strong that the advanced forces and national leaders

of many countries advocate taking the socialist path, and are actually taking steps in this direction, counting with good reason on support from the socialist countries and the Marxist-Leninist parties.

Except for "Leftist" phrases about the armed struggle, the Chinese leaders have nothing to say to the peoples of the newly-free countries concerning the lines along which they should wage their struggle for a better future. They have, in fact, no positive ideas that would help the progressive forces in one-time colonies to fight for socialism.

The Chinese leaders pretend that the interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are particularly near and dear to them and that they are concerned above all else with the further progress of the national liberation movement. The facts, however, give them the lie. It is becoming increasingly evident that they are prompted by other considerations. The CPC leadership is clearly trying to establish control over the national liberation struggle in order to make it an instrument for the implementation of its hegemonic plans. The arguments contained in the Jenminjihpao article of October 22, 1963, already mentioned, are typical in this respect. That newspaper tries hard to prove that "true" Marxists-Leninists are to be found in Peking only, and makes it perfectly clear that the national liberation movement should take its bearings from them. The Chinese leaders call on the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to follow Peking's lead in everything. The article clearly expresses the CPC leadership's claim to hegemony in the national liberation movement, and their desire to subordinate it to their special aims.

That probably sheds more light than anything else on the true object of the Chinese leaders' policy of dissociating the national liberation movement from the world socialist system and from the international working class.

It is with that object in view that the CPC leaders have spread the infamous falsehood that the CPSU "underestimates" the historical role of the national liberation movement and that the Soviet Union "refuses to help" the national liberation movement on the pretext of fighting for peaceful coexistence. We need not refute this ill-intentioned slander. Whatever "strong language" the Chinese leaders may use against the CPSU, they cannot cite a single fact bearing out their lying contentions.

But the CPC leaders do not confine themselves to slander. In the steps they take officially and in various world democratic organisations, they concentrate not on furthering the unity of the anti-imperialist forces, but on the struggle against the USSR and other socialist countries. That was what Chinese delegates did, in particular, at the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Moshi.

At that Conference Liu Ning-yi, head of the Chinese delegation, said in an interview with our delegates: "East European countries should not interfere in Asian and African affairs... We regret the fact that you have come here at all. Who wants you here? It is an insult to the solidarity movement of the Afro-Asian countries.... You may do as you will, but we shall be against you." The Chinese delegates at that Conference suggested to Asian and African delegates that since the Russians, Czechs and Poles are whites, "they cannot be trusted", that they would "always be able to come to terms with the American whites", and that the peoples of Asia and Africa had interests of their own and must form their separate associations.

Lately, the Chinese leaders have virtually begun to form separate (trade union, journalistic, writers', student, sports, etc.) organisations for Asian, African and Latin American countries, which they plan to set up against the World Federation of Trade Unions and other international associations.

In the light of the practical activities of the Chinese leaders in recent years, the true political meaning of their slogan—"The wind from the East is beginning to prevail over the wind from the West"—has become all the clearer. It will be recalled that at the Meeting of 1960 that slogan was sharply criticised as a nationalist slogan substituting the geographic, and even the racial approach for the class approach. It is clearly an attempt to minimise the role of the world socialist system, the working class and the peoples of Western Europe and America.

The Chinese theoreticians would like to substitute the call for setting the Eastern peoples apart on a nationalist and even racial basis for the Leninist idea of uniting the anti-imperialist forces of all countries and continents, expressed in the slogan "Workers of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!" Their slogan about the supposedly magic power of the wind from the East is plainly designed to

foment nationalist and even racial sentiments among the peoples fighting against colonialism.

Long years of enslavement and exploitation by the imperialists, who mocked at the honour and national dignity of the oppressed peoples, have aroused distrust of people of the white race in a section of the population of the former colonies and semi-colonies, and still nourish that sentiment. It is this sentiment that the Chinese leaders are trying to fan in the hope of setting up the peoples of the former colonies and semi-colonies against the socialist countries and the working people of the developed capitalist countries, and of representing themselves as the sole defenders of the interests of those peoples. For, if we are to lay bare the secret design behind the Chinese slogan and reveal the far-reaching aim of the CPC leaders, it is like this: China, according to them, is the biggest country of the East, it embodies the interests of the East, and it is here that the "winds of history" spring up that are to "prevail over" the winds from the "West".

In other words, that slogan is nothing but an ideological and political expression of the hegemonic aspirations of the Chinese leadership.

It is natural that the Chinese leaders, who are hatching that sort of plans, regard close ties between the national liberation movement, on the one hand, and the world socialist system and the international working-class movement, on the other, as a most serious obstacle to the realisation of their schemes. Hence the CPC leaders' policy of dissociating the Asian, African and Latin American countries from the USSR and other socialist countries and from the working class of the capitalist countries. Needless to say that policy is in crying conflict with the vital interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. As the facts show, it is meeting with growing resistance on their part.

And that is understandable, because the policy of the CPC leaders, which is aimed at undermining the alliance of the newly-free countries and the socialist countries, may cause great damage primarily to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In effect, that policy dooms the peoples of those countries to aloofness and isolation, to the "bottling up" of all that is narrowly national; it shuts them off from the international experience of the revolutionary movement and the construction of the new society, and thereby facilitates the imperialist struggle against the national liberation movement.

The tremendous progress which the national liberation movement has made in our day was made possible by its close links with the peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and with the revolutionary movement of the international working class. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other Marxist-Leninist parties regard the national liberation movement as a major revolutionary factor of today, one which makes a historic contribution to the struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism.

The Great October Socialist Revolution for the first time in history showed all the enslaved people the real way to liberation from national oppression. It initiated the great revolutionary process which today has culminated in the collapse of the colonial system, an event of history-making significance.

The national liberation revolutions triumphed in new historical conditions. First of all, there arose, and has been developing and gaining strength, the world socialist system, which is becoming the decisive factor in the progress of society. Secondly, the defeat in the Second World War of the striking forces of imperialism—Hitler Germany, fascist Italy and militarist Japan—resulted in a considerable weakening of world reaction. Thirdly, the working class and all working people of the colonial powers stepped up their fight against the colonial policies of the imperialists.

All that provided an exceptionally favourable situation for the victories of the national liberation movement and enabled to encompass the colonial and semi-colonial periphery of imperialism on three continents—Asia, Africa and Latin America. We greatly appreciate the assistance which the national liberation struggle is rendering to the socialist countries and to all revolutionary forces.

Unity of all the revolutionary forces is an earnest of victory in the anti-imperialist struggle. The fundamental national interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America fully coincide with those of the socialist community, and of the working class and all working people in all countries. This is the objective basis of the growing

solidarity of the revolutionary forces fighting against imperialism.

Back in the days when our country was the only socialist state Lenin wrote that "the revolutionary movement of the peoples of the East can now develop effectively, and can reach a successful issue only in direct association with the revolutionary struggle of our Soviet Republic against international imperialism." (Coll. Works, Vol. 30, p. 130; Russ. ed.) Lenin's words sound with particular force now that there exists the world socialist system.

What, specifically, does support for the national liberation movement on the part of the socialist countries mean today?

The internationalist duty of the socialist countries is to foil imperialist attempts at re-establishing colonial regimes in the newly-free countries and preventing the realisation of the national aspirations of the peoples that have thrown off colonial tyranny. In all such cases, the duty of the socialist countries is to give those countries political and diplomatic support, and when necessary, to curb the imperialist aggressors by using the whole might of the world socialist system.

Our policy, which is aimed at assisting the peoples fighting for their freedom, is based on the lofty principles of proletarian internationalism, on the behests of the great Lenin.

Many times our Party and Government have stated their views on questions of the national liberation movement, clearly and in great detail. The answers which Comrade Khrushchov gave to the questions of a number of African and Asian newspapers and which were published not long ago, say in no uncertain terms: "Every people fighting against the colonialists has been firmly supported by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Today we declare once again, for all to hear, that the peoples fighting for their liberation can continue to count firmly on our support."

The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America know well that the Soviet Union actively supports the national liberation, just wars which the people wage against their enslavers. The Soviet Union, like other socialist countries, is doing everything to help the national liberation movement—economically, politically and, if necessary, militarily—and to prevent the imperialists from unleashing local wars and exporting counter-revolution by force of arms.

We have only to refer to such facts as the support given to Egypt during the Suez venture of the Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggressors, the assistance extended to Indonesia in its struggle to promote its independence and recover Western Irian, and many other facts. No people who have asked our support have met with a refusal. The soldiers of the heroic national liberation army of Algeria and the armed forces of Indonesia, the Yemen and other countries know well whose arms helped them in the struggle against the colonialists for freedom and independence.

In the recent period the Soviet government has repeatedly and resolutely come out in defence of peoples fighting for their national independence. It has supported the peoples of Panama and Cyprus in their anti-imperialist struggle, voiced its solidarity with the courageous resistance put up by the Vietnamese people to US aggression, warned the British and US imperialists against interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Zanzibar, and exposed colonialist intrigues in East Africa.

Now that the achievement of economic sovereignty and social progress have become the chief direction in which the anti-imperialist struggle of the newly-free countries is developing, it is particularly important to expand economic co-operation between the socialist countries and those countries, and to render them fraternal economic assistance.

The Soviet Union unfailingly fulfils its duty. Soviet credits to newly-free countries on favourable terms add up to a total exceeding 3,000 million roubles. The Soviet Union is helping to build about 500 industrial and other establishments in several dozens of newly-free countries. It is rendering disinterested assistance to the newly-free countries in setting up a national industry, the bulwark of economic independence. The Bhilai Iron and Steel Works and the Aswan High Dam will always be remembered by the peoples as symbols of fraternal co-operation between socialist countries and the countries that have freed themselves from colonial tyranny.

Thousands of students from newly-sovereign states receive an education in our country. Growing economic relations between the USSR and other socialist countries, on the one hand, and Asian, African and Latin American

countries, on the other, have ended the monopoly which the imperialist powers had on deliveries of plant and the granting of credits. These powers often have to make concessions to underdeveloped countries with regard to loan terms, in the field of trade, and so on. Economic blockade, a weapon which in the past never failed, has been knocked out of the hands of the imperialists.

The peoples of the newly-free countries know that they can win the battle against the domination of international monopolies if they draw on the economic power of the socialist system. The growing economic potential of the socialist countries is in their best interest. Today the achievements of the socialist countries in the economic competition with capitalism, and their expanding economic relations with newly-sovereign states constitute one of the most important forms in which socialism gives the peoples of the newly-free countries effective support.

The Chinese leaders, however, suggest to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America that the socialist countries' policy of peaceful economic competition allegedly runs counter to their interests. They do all they can to smear the economic assistance which the USSR and other socialist countries render to the less developed countries and try to induce them to question the purpose of that assistance. But the peoples of the newly-free countries who have gained considerable political experience, will be in a position to see for themselves what the Chinese leaders are driving at and what they really want, and will reject a policy aimed at subordinating them to the selfish plans of the Chinese leaders.

Soviet people are confident that the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who are well familiar with the actual facts concerning Soviet assistance, will themselves draw the right conclusions as to the worth of the slanderous fabrications of the Chinese leaders. They can do this all the more easily because they can compare the deeds of the Soviet Union with the Chinese leaders' actions in recent years

We are firmly convinced that the national liberation movement, which has become one of the greatest progressive factors of today, will, despite all difficulties, and in close alliance with the world socialist system and the anti-imperialist forces, march on along its own path, towards

final victory over the imperialist forces, and will bring the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America deliverance from age-long backwardness, will lead them to national and social prosperity.

The Soviet Union has invariably advocated the abolition of every form of colonial oppression. It considers fraternal alliance with the peoples that have cast off colonial and semi-colonial tyranny as a corner-stone of its foreign policy.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has always helped the peoples fighting against imperialism for their freedom and national independence, and will continue to do so. No amount of slander and no falsehoods can hinder the growing friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and the peoples of the countries which have freed themselves from colonial dependence.

IV

ON SOVIET-CHINESE RELATIONS

Comrades,

The CC CPSU and the Soviet Government have always attached great importance to the development of friendship and co-operation with the People's Republic of China. We have never sought any advantage or profit, and have always been internationalist in our attitude towards the CPC and the Chinese people.

For many years we have supported the working people of China, their Communist vanguard, in the struggle for independence, for the victory of the socialist revolution. We considered it our duty to help the Chinese people fraternally in the building of socialism, the strengthening of the international position of the CPR, and in the defence of its socialist gains.

Our Party, the Soviet people know the scale and the nature of the economic assistance rendered by the Soviet Union to China. In a short period of time the USSR helped the People's Republic of China to build over 200 large industrial enterprises, shops and other projects, equipped with modern machinery. The CPR has built with Soviet aid whole branches of industry, which China had not had

before: aircraft-, automobile- and tractor-building industries, power-producing, heavy machine-building and precision machine-building industries, instrument-making and radio-engineering, and various branches of the chemical industry.

The factories built and reconstructed with Soviet assistance enable China to produce annually 8,700,000 tons of iron, 8,400,000 tons of steel, and 32,200,000 tons of coal and shale. Enterprises built with the help of our country account for 70 per cent of China's tin output, 100 per cent of its synthetic rubber output, 25 to 30 per cent of its electric power output, and 80 per cent of the lorries and tractors produced annually. The defence factories built with the technical assistance of the Soviet Union constituted the core for the building of China's defence industry.

More than 10,000 Soviet specialists were sent to the People's Republic of China for varying terms between 1950 and 1960. Some 10,000 Chinese engineers, technicians and skilled workers, and about 1,000 scientists, were taught and trained in the USSR between 1951 and 1962. More than 11,000 students and post-graduates graduated from Soviet higher educational establishments in this period.

Soviet-Chinese co-operation reached its peak after 1953, when elements of inequality in the relations between our countries imposed during the Stalin personality cult, were removed on the initiative of the CC CPSU and Comrade N. S. Khrushchov. "In the Chinese question," Mao Tse-tung said in 1957, "the credit for removing the disagreeable and the extraneous belongs to N. S. Khrushchov."

In 1959 the proportions of Soviet-Chinese economic contacts were nearly double those of 1953, while deliveries for the building projects increased in that period as much as eightfold. Between 1954 and 1963 the Soviet Union turned over to China more than 24,000 sets of scientific and technical documents, including 1,400 projects of large industrial enterprises. These documents contained the vast experience accumulated by the Soviet people, by its scientists and technicians. In effect, all these scientific and technical documents were turned over to China gratuitously.

The Soviet Union granted the People's Republic of China long-term credits totalling 1,816 million roubles on favourable terms.

The CC CPSU and the Soviet Government spared no effort for China to assume firmly the place of a great social-

ist power on the international scene, and worked perseveringly for the restoration of the rights of the CPR in the United Nations. We regularly informed the leadership of the CPR of all the key political actions of the Soviet Union and strove to co-ordinate the foreign policies of our two countries.

It should be said that, while assisting People's China, the CC CPSU for its part always highly appreciated the support of the CPR. What we mean are not only the various valuable Chinese items of export received by the USSR and the experience made available to us by the Chinese scientists, but also the common struggle for the consolidation of peace, against imperialism and colonialism.

In 1950, the Soviet Union and the CPR concluded a Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance, which became an important factor not only in the development of versatile relations between our two countries, but also in the strengthening of peace in the Far East.

The Soviet Union has always faithfully abided by all the commitments under this Treaty. Every time a threat arose to the security of the CPR, the USSR demonstrated its readiness to perform its allied duty to the end. In the autumn of 1958, for example, Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, head of the Soviet Government, declared in a message to US President Eisenhower that "an attack on the People's Republic of China, the great friend, ally and neighbour of our country, would be tantamount to an attack on the Soviet Union." This declaration was re-affirmed in all earnest in July 1962. The above shows how earnestly the Soviet Government approached the strengthening of Soviet-Chinese friendship.

However, to our regret, ever since 1958 the Government of the CPR has been taking various measures undermining Soviet-Chinese friendship and creating difficulties on the world scene by its uncoordinated actions not only for the Soviet Union, but also for other socialist countries.

Soviet-Chinese relations deteriorated most markedly after the CPC leaders went over from isolated unfriendly acts to a sharp curtailment of economic and cultural relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Already on the eve of the 1960 Moscow Meeting of Fraternal Parties, the Chinese Government demanded that all ag-

reements and protocols earlier concluded with the Soviet Union on economic, scientific and technical co-operation be revised. Besides, the Chinese Government turned down a considerable part of the planned deliveries of Soviet equipment, reducing to a minimum the volume of Soviet-Chinese trade.

Although the Soviet Government was aware that this course of the Chinese leaders would harm Soviet-Chinese friendship and co-operation, it had no choice but to consent to it. As a result, the total volume of economic co-operation between the Soviet Union and the CPR (including trade and technical assistance) dropped in 1962 to 36.5 per cent of what it was in 1959, while deliveries of sets of equipment and materials decreased 40-fold. In 1963 economic co-operation and trade continued to drop.

It stands to reason that we could not look on indifferently while Soviet-Chinese co-operation shrank so acutely. Time and again the CC CPSU called on the CC CPC to avert this process. We suggested a number of concrete measures for it, but the Chinese leaders did not respond to our suggestions. In pursuance of their special aims, they worsened China's relations with the Soviet Union step by step and began to spread the ideological differences to the sphere of inter-state relations.

Having set their course on curtailing economic contacts with the USSR and other socialist countries, the CPC leaders at first explained this as follows:

"Firstly, thanks to the assistance of the Soviet Union the primary foundations of modern industry and technology have been laid in China, and, therefore, the building and designing of most projects will in future proceed with domestic resources. We want to ease the efforts of the Soviet Union with respect to its assistance to China. However, in the future, too, we shall have to ask for Soviet assistance in relation to projects that we shall not be able to design, build and equip on our own,

"Secondly, the CC CPC and the Chinese Government consider it necessary to concentrate their resources on the building of the most important projects, while reducing the total number of capital projects and non-urgent projects in order to put into practice the 'better, more, faster and cheaper' principle of socialist construction in the CPR. The

scale of building in the country will continue to be big and the rates high.

"Thirdly, due to the natural calamities in agriculture in the last two years, certain difficulties have arisen with regard to the balance of payments, and, therefore, by reducing the number of projects built with the help of the Soviet Union we hope to create conditions for more favourable co-operation between our countries." (Quoted from the statement by Ku Cho-hsin, head of the CPR Government delegation at the Soviet-Chinese negotiations on February 10,1961.)

Yet today, having evidently "forgotten" its previous explanations, the CPR Government maintains that Soviet-Chinese contacts were reduced on the initiative of the Soviet Union and that this is the cause for China's difficult economic situation of the last few years.

Today, Chinese propagandists go out of their way to prove that there has never been any Soviet assistance to China and that there have been no more than ordinary commercial operations. Bent on erasing the memory of Soviet assistance among the people, the Chinese go to the length of removing trade marks from Soviet lathes and other machinery, and allege that the Soviet Union delivered obsolete equipment to China. This is said in spite of the fact that the Chinese themselves, and the foreign press as well, noted that enterprises built with Soviet assistance, such as the Changchun Automobile Works, the Harbin Electrical Engineering Works, the Loyang Tractor Works, and many others, are splendid models of modern industry.

Such actions have little in common with any concept of common decency. While leaving them to the conscience of the Chinese leadership, we cannot help noting the obvious discrepancies in their charges against the Soviet Union. On the one hand, they try to blame the USSR for reducing its assistance and creating serious difficulties for China's economy. On the other, they spread rumours that Soviet assistance was ineffective and insignificant. Yet if it were granted that our assistance was "ineffective and insignificant", then how could its cessation harm China's economy?

To use the favourite expression of the Chinese leaders, where is the truth and where the untruth on this score? The facts show that it is nothing but untruth all round.

In spite of the candidly hostile actions of the CPC leadership, our country is living up faithfully to earlier commit-

ments and continuing to assist China in the building of 80 industrial enterprises. Engineers, technicians, scientists and students from the CPR are being trained in the Soviet Union as before. The Soviet Union responded fraternally to the economic difficulties that arose in China in 1960 and 1961. At a time when particularly acute food shortages occurred in the CPR, the CC CPSU and the Soviet Government offered the CPC leadership a loan of 1,000,000 tons of grain and 500,000 tons of sugar. At the same time, the Soviet Union granted the CPR five years' deferment on payments due for commercial transactions to the amount of 288 million roubles.

If, as the Chinese leadership claims, it was the Soviet Union that sought to curtail its economic relations with China, why did it have to take all these steps, why continue its assistance in building industrial enterprises, and why make repeated offers for greater mutually advantageous trade and economic co-operation? The CPC leadership gives no reply to this question. Nor can it do so, because it was none other than the Chinese leadership that sought the curtailment of co-operation between our countries.

Seeking to justify, to some extent at least, the economic failures of the CPR, brought about by the "big leap" policy, the CPC leaders lay a particular accent on the question of Soviet specialists. So, although this issue has been repeatedly dealt with in our Party's official documents, we are compelled to dwell upon it once more.

The Government of the USSR sent specialists to China in the belief that they were needed to assist in the development of China's national economy, which did not have qualified personnel in sufficient numbers. It was by no means a commercial transaction, but an act of genuine fraternal assistance to the Chinese people.

Seeing that the demand for foreign specialists is temporary in nature and that qualified personnel of their own was rapidly growing in the fraternal socialist countries, the Soviet Government broached the question of recalling our specialists first in 1956, and once again in 1958. Similar offers were also made at the time to the other People's Democracies where Soviet specialists were still working then. Since the specialists were not needed any longer these offers were accepted by all the countries, excluding the CPR, whose government requested that the Soviet specialists stay on for a certain time.

While insisting that the Soviet specialists remain, the Chinese authorities deliberately treated them worse than before, and created intolerable conditions for their work.

The last years of our specialists' stay in the CPR coincided with the "big leap" policy, which unbalanced the proportions of economic development and caused departures from accepted technical standards. The Soviet people could not help seeing the dangerous implications of this policy. They warned the Chinese authorities against violating the technical requirements. But their advice fell on deaf ears. Due to the fact that the recommendations of the Soviet specialists were ignored and that the Chinese officials grossly violated the technical standards, large breakdowns occurred, some of them involving a loss of life. This happened on the building site of the Hsinantsiang Hydropower Station, where thousands of tons of rock crashed down because the technical requirements were scorned, and work on the project was considerably delayed. The dams burst and pit was flooded at the Hsinfungtsiang Hydropower project for the same reason. In both cases there was a loss of life. It is only natural that the Soviet engineers and technicians could not treat all this with indifference. They protested, but being ignored, they began asking to be sent home.

Furthermore, beginning in the spring of 1960 the Chinese authorities began "indoctrinating" the Soviet specialists, trying to incline them against the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Government of the USSR. This aroused the legitimate indignation of our people.

The Government of the USSR has repeatedly called the attention of the Chinese authorities to all these outrageous facts, and requested insistently that normal conditions be provided for the work of the Soviet specialists. But the Chinese authorities responded by treating our people in a still more unfriendly and insulting fashion, by spurning them as "conservatives", and by reviling Soviet experience and technology in every way. Surveillance of Soviet people increased, searches of personal belongings became more frequent, and the like. In the circumstances, there was no choice but to recall our specialists.

Now, after many additional facts have come to light, there is every reason to believe that after 1959, when the Chinese leadership began aggravating its relations with

the USSR, it did not need the specialists so much as the issue of these specialists, which they could use as one of the pretexts for the struggle against the CPSU.

After recalling the Soviet specialists, the Soviet Government sought an adjustment of the matter in the interests of strengthening Soviet-Chinese friendship. In November 1960, on the instructions of the CC CPSU Comrade A. I. Mikoyan told the Chinese leaders at the Moscow Meeting of Fraternal Parties in an official conversation that if China really needed Soviet specialists and if they were provided normal conditions for work, we were prepared to send them back to the CPR. Comrade N. S. Khrushchov said the same thing in his talk with Chou En-lai and the other members of the CPC delegation to the 22nd Congress of the CPSU. At the bilateral meeting of the CPSU and CPC delegations (in July 1963) and in the Letter of the CC CPSU of November 29, 1963, the Chinese leadership was again officially informed that if it required the technical help of our specialists, the Soviet Government was prepared to examine the question of sending them to the CPR. The Chinese leaders did not reply to all these proposals, while continuing to exploit the question of Soviet specialists for their unseemly ends. They even tried to blame the revision of their economic plans, the reduction of capital building and the difficulties which arose in the various branches of their economy by the withdrawal of our specialists.

But, to begin with, everybody knows that the economic difficulties in the CPR arose before the Soviet specialists had been recalled, and that they arose due to the dangerous "big leap" experiment. Secondly, the greatest difficulties arose in economic branches where there were very few or no Soviet specialists at all.

How, for example, could the recall of the Soviet specialists affect the coal, oil, timber, light and other industries, and agriculture as well, if, in 1960, there were two specialists working in the coal industry, three in the Ministry of State Farms and Virgin Lands, and one each in the departments of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry? Yet it was these very branches, and especially agriculture, that suffered the greatest failures.

Is it not high time for the Chinese leaders to stop misleading their Party, their people and world opinion, and to speak the truth about the real reasons for the difficulties of the Chinese people?

These reasons stem from the fact that the CPC leaders ignored the objective laws in their economic policy.

How to explain the fact that lately, due to the exertions of the CPC leadership, Soviet-Chinese economic co-operation, cultural relations and exchanges between public organisations are dwindling from year to year, while insinuations and slander pour forth against the Soviet people in increasing numbers? There is only one explanation: the Chinese leaders want to fence their people off from the Soviet Union. They are afraid that their people will learn the truth about the selfless fraternal Soviet proposals for the development of relations between the USSR and the CPR, and that then their vicious slander, whereby they seek to tarnish our Party and the Soviet people, will explode in their faces. The CPC leadership fears that cooperation with our country may carry as far as China the purifying breath of the 20th Congress ideas, which dissipated the intolerable situation created by the Stalin personality cult.

We also consider it necessary to tell the Plenum about the violations of the Soviet-Chinese border, occasioned through the fault of the Chinese side. This has already been mentioned in the documents of the CPSU and the Soviet Government. In 1962 and 1963 violations of the Soviet border kept occurring continuously, often assuming the form of crude provocations.

The Soviet Government has come forward with the initiative of holding consultations in order to specify the border line between the USSR and the CPR at certain of its points. We do so in the belief that no territorial issues exist between the USSR and the CPR, that the Soviet-Chinese border took shape historically, and that the issue can concern only some sections of the border, to make them more precise wherever necessary.

Undermining the foundations of Soviet-Chinese friendship, the CPC leaders have organised a malicious anti-Soviet propaganda campaign at home and abroad. The Chinese newspapers are full of slanderous articles which malign Soviet reality and cast foul aspersions on the Soviet people. In one CPR Government statement the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is described as "a policy

of association with the forces of war for struggle against the forces of peace, association with imperialism for struggle against socialism".

All these contentions are, from beginning to end, nothing but ranting slander, absolutely obvious not only to our friends, but also to our enemies. The Soviet Communists, all Soviet people, reject these brazen lies with indignation. The slanderers may go about their foul business but the Soviet Union will continue to advance along the Leninist course as before.

V

ATTACKS BY THE CPC LEADERS ON THE PROGRAMME OF THE CPSU

Comrades, lately the CPC leaders have spread their polemics also to questions concerning the internal development of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They have made the Programme of the CPSU the object of their attacks.

It is generally recognised that our Party Programme is one of the most outstanding documents of modern time and that it reflects with unusual depth and force the practice of the building of new society in the USSR and the fraternal countries on the basis of the theory of scientific communism. Defying common sense, Chinese propaganda has in its attacks on the Programme of the CPSU gone to the length of absurd and monstrous slander, alleging that it is "aimed against the revolutions of the peoples which are still dominated by imperialism and capitalism", that it is "aimed against the completion of the revolution by the peoples which have already embarked on socialism" and, of all things, that it is aimed at "preserving and restoring capitalism" (Articles in the **Jenminjihpao** and the journal **Hungchi**, September 6, 1963.)

In opposing the CPSU Programme, the Chinese leaders are trying to discredit the theory and practice of proletarian socialism, which has been victorious in the working class movement after a long struggle against petty-bourgeois socialism, anarchism and other anti-scientific doctrines. Whether they admit it or not, the

leaders of the CPC are reviving the conceptions of petty-bourgeois socialism and trying to criticise the international experience of the building of new society from these positions.

The Chinese leaders are attacking the CPSU because it is pursuing a policy of improving the people's standard of living. They say that the improvement of the living standard is making Soviet people "go bourgeois", and that the principle of material incentives "results in people seeking personal gain and enrichment, inducing the itch for profit and a growth of bourgeois individualism, and injuring socialist economics.... even corrupting it" (**Jenminjihpao**, December 26, 1963).

Is there not deep-seated contempt for the vital requirements of men, for the principles and ideals of socialist society, behind these strident contentions?

It may be recalled what great importance Lenin attached to the principle of socialist distribution according to labour, to material incentives for the development of social production. He taught us that new society should not be built by enthusiasm alone, but with the help of enthusiasm roused by the great revolution, by a personal interest, by incentives, on a cost-accounting basis.

The Chinese leaders ferociously attack the conclusions in the Programme of the CPSU concerning the political organisation of socialist society as it advances to Communism. They maintain that the propositions of the Programme of the CPSU on the state of the whole people and the party of the whole people substitute bourgeois theories for the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state, that they are tantamount to a disarmament of the working class.

The Chinese leaders do not even try to analyse the actual processes operating in the socialist countries. Instead, they juggle with quotations snatched out of context from the works of the Marxist-Leninist classics, and interpret them incorrectly. They try to impose quasi-theoretical discussions on the world Communist movement concerning matters that have long since been settled by the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

One of these issues concerns their dogmatic contentions about the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Chinese leaders maintain stubbornly that the dictatorship of the proletariat should be preserved "until the entry into the highest

phase of communist society". In doing so they refer to a quotation from Karl Marx, which says that "between the capitalist and communist society lies a period of the revolutionary transformation of the first into the second. This period conforms also with the political transitional period, and the state of this period cannot be anything but **a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat"**. (K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, 2nd ed., Vol. 19, p. 27, Russ. ed.)

This quotation, snatched out of the context of Marx's exposition, is being exploited as the theoretical basis for "the criticism" of the Programme of the CPSU.

But the Chinese leaders have clipped Marx's exposition, and do not quote the next two lines from the same work by Marx, which says with respect to the Gotha Programme. "But the programme does not concern itself with either this last (that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat—M.S.) or the future statehood in communist society". To follow the logic of the Chinese theorists, Marx should be declared an anti-Marxist for saying this. Indeed, the Chinese theorists proceed from what they call Marxist ideas to say that "the withering away of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is also the withering away of the state". Yet Marx speaks about the "statehood in communist society", which is no longer a dictatorship of the proletariat.

That is just the point. When speaking of the transitional period from capitalism to communism, Marx has in mind the first phase of communism, that is, socialism.

Surely, the Chinese leaders know that Marx and Engels have spoken more than once about the two phases of communism and about the dictatorship of the proletariat being a state of the transitional period, whose aim—the building of socialism—is the aim of the first phase of communism. Pointing to the inevitably long and persistent struggle for the socialist rearrangement of society, Lenin wrote about "a whole period of dictatorship by the proletariat as a period of transition from capitalism to socialism". (Works, Vol. 29, p. 358, Russ. ed.)

The Peking theorists go out of their way to hush up the proposition emphasised by Lenin. What he said was that the dictatorship of the proletariat was necessary "for the purpose of the final building and consolidation of socialism" (Works, Vol. 29, p. 351, Russ. ed.), and that, once the danger that capitalist relations may be restored disappears, there comes "an end to the dictatorship of the proletariat". (Works, Vol. 33, p. 75, Russ. ed.).

That was how Vladimir Lenin put it.

The facts have completely confirmed that Lenin's propositions were correct. If the Chinese leaders had really been concerned about the truth, they could have turned to our every-day practice and seen how the economic basis and social structure of Soviet society have changed. Lenin considered that the suppression of the overthrown exploiting classes was the most important feature of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Socialist society in the USSR, as we know, long since consists of friendly classes—the workers and peasants, and the social group of the people's intelligentsia. They are welded by common basic interests, by the Marxist-Leninist ideology and by their identical goal—the building of communism.

Against whom do the Chinese theorists suggest that we enforce dictatorship? What are they leading up to, and how to interpret their demand that the CPSU should carry through a "policy of class struggle" inside the country?

All of us know what the theory put forward by Stalin about the inevitable aggravation of class struggle as the successes of socialist construction accumulate has caused. It may be recalled, that this theory served as a vindication for gross violations of socialist legality. The CPSU has put an end to it and will never allow anything like it to happen again. It has pursued and will continue to pursue a policy of strengthening the alliance between the working class and the peasants, of uniting all working people in a single collective of builders of communism.

The ideas of a state of the whole people and the party of the whole people are not the fruit of arm-chair rumination. They were generated by reality and reflect the high maturity which social relations have attained in the USSR. In view of the fact that the exploiting classes have long since been abolished in the USSR, the Soviet state, having lost the character of a body suppressing the overthrown exploiters, now expresses the interests and the will of the whole people, while the party of the working class has become a party of the whole people.

After the complete and final victory of socialism the working class no longer effects its guiding role through the dictatorship of the proletariat. It remains the foremost

class of society also in the period of full-scale communist construction. Its advanced role hinges both on its economic position, on the fact that it is connected directly with the highest form of socialist property, and on the fact that it possesses the greatest steeling, acquired through decades of class struggle and by revolutionary experience.

All these propositions of the CPSU Programme are not by any means of just theoretical importance. They define the practical policy of our Party, the policy of drawing the whole people into the administration of the affairs of society, of increasing the people's activity in the building of communism, of extending socialist democracy. Yet the Chinese leaders ignore Lenin's precept that "socialism is impossible without democracy". (Works, Vol. 23, p. 62.). It is indicative that there is not the slightest mention of socialist democracy and the need to develop it while advancing to communism, in the Letter of the CC CPC of June 14, 1963, and in the other statements of the Chinese leadership.

Does idealisation by the CPC leadership of methods of violence and suppression during the entire period of transition from capitalism to communism have anything in common with the Marxist-Leninist approach to the matter?

While noting that the proletariat could not have won without employing revolutionary violence against the landed proprietors and capitalists, Lenin wrote that "revolutionary violence was a necessary and lawful method of revolution only in certain periods of its development and only in certain and special circumstances, while organisation of the proletarian masses, organisation of the working people, was and remains a much more deep-rooted, permanent feature of this revolution and the requisite for its victories." (Works, Vol. 29, p. 70, Russ. ed.)

The Chinese theorists maintain:

"Everyone who has an elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism knows that the so-called 'state of the whole people' is no novelty. Representatives of the bourgeoisie always call the bourgeois state 'a state of the whole people' or 'a state of people's power'."

A strong argument, no doubt! To follow this train of thought, the Communists would also have to abandon the realisation of such slogans as freedom, equality, fraternity

and democracy for the sole reason that they were put forward in the bourgeois revolution and subsequently perverted and debased by the bourgeoisie on coming to power. We, on the contrary, think that the true meaning of these slogans should be revived, that these slogans should be carried into practice, and that this is possible only under socialism and communism.

So much for the conception of the state of the whole people.

When Lassalle spoke of such a state, or when imperialist ideologists speak of it today, the Marxists say rightly that their theory is nothing but deception of the people. For what these people have in mind is a state of the whole people in a class society, while such a state cannot exist in a society split into hostile classes. A state that develops out of the dictatorship of the proletariat that has completed its historic mission of socialist construction within the country is an entirely different matter. Such a state can be nothing but a body expressing the interests and the will of the whole people.

The Soviet state of the whole people, in which the working class retains its guiding role, is continuing the cause begun by the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It performs faithfully its internationalist duty to the international working class and all the peoples of the world. The state of the whole people struggles consistently against imperialism. It ensures reliably the defences of its country and contributes to the defence of the whole socialist camp. It develops fraternal co-operation with the socialist countries.

It is typical of the methods of the Chinese leaders in the polemics to falsely depict the conclusion drawn in the Programme of the CPSU about the growing over of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people under certain historical conditions as a rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the period of socialist construction. The Chinese theorists have even gone to the length of saying that the CPSU has "completely flung overboard the quintessence of Marxism-Leninism—the teaching of the dictatorship of the proletariat".

That is a dirty and shameless lie! It is inscribed in the Programme of the CPSU in so many words that "Soviet experience has shown that the peoples can achieve

socialism only as a result of the **socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.**"

The Chinese leaders do not bother to examine the matter in substance and also attempt to malign the conclusion of the Programme of the CPSU **on the transformation of the Communist Party of the working class in our country into a party of the whole people.** They describe this conclusion as an "organisational and moral disarmament of the proletariat", and even as a "service to the restoration of capitalism".

Have the Chinese leaders at all tried to substantiate their monstrous accusations against the Party that heads the building of communism? Nothing of the sort! They have merely, without reason and argument, hitched this question to the question of the state. If the state cannot be of the whole people until the complete victory of communism, they say, then the Party cannot be of the whole people either. That is the only argument they make.

The working-class party, without which the dictatorship of that class is impracticable, retains its proletarian class character, both formally and in substance, until the final victory of socialism. That is an indisputable fact.

But it is also indisputable that as a political organisation the Party also reflects the changes occurring in the class structure of society. The CPSU has stressed in its Programme that until the complete victory of communism the working class remains the leading force of Soviet society. In the period of full-scale communist construction, too, the Party is the spokesman of communist ideals, the goals of the working class, and of its basic interests. At the same time, it becomes a party of the whole people. This does not happen just because someone wishes it subjectively, but because the working-class goals and ideals become the goals and ideals of all the classes and strata of the people that has built socialism.

While attacking the propositions of the CPSU Programme concerning the historic fate of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the nature of the state and working-class party in the Soviet Union, the Chinese theorists ignore the new phenomena of social life and refuse stubbornly to see that the new conclusions and propositions of the CPSU Programme were not framed arbitrarily, and that they express what has become part of life. As they

attack the course charted by the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU, they go to the length of questioning the very right of our Party and people to build communism.

The transition of a society that has built socialism to the full-scale building of communism is a historically inevitable and objectively necessary process. It is a vital task for the Soviet people, a task put forward by life. We have all the necessary economic, political and other resources, built up thanks to the victory of the socialist system, for its practical implementation. To obstruct this process is to try and stop social progress. The facts have confirmed over and over again that attempts to by-pass historically inevitable stages in social development and attempts to retard and slow down social development are equally wrong and harmful.

The men in Peking are evidently so badly blinded by the factional struggle that they have, in the heat of the fray, unconsciously come into conflict with themselves. Just a few years ago, while proclaiming the "big leap" and "people's communes" policy, the CC CPC maintained that "apparently, the realisation of communism in our country is not something remote". (Decision of the CC CPC, August 29, 1958.) Consequently, at that time the Chinese leaders thought it quite possible to go over to communist construction in their own country, although the building of socialism was then only beginning in China. Yet today they question communist construction in the USSR, where the final and complete victory of socialism has been achieved.

How can one fail to see the fact that the building of communism in countries that have built socialism accords with the interests of the peoples of all the socialist countries, all the revolutionary forces of our time? Is it not clear that it adds immensely to socialism's force of attraction, that it adds to the economic and defensive potential of the socialist camp, and that it creates increasingly favourable opportunities for greater effective economic, technical, cultural and other assistance and support with regard to all the peoples fighting for socialist construction, for national independence and peace, against imperialism.

How can it be denied that the country marching first to communism is making the advance to communism easier and quicker for the world socialist system as a whole, since

its peoples are breaking untrodden paths for all mankind, checking how correct they are by their own experience, revealing the difficulties, finding means of combating them, and picking the best forms and methods of communist construction. It is this course that we consider correct, because it is the only course along which the peoples of the socialist countries can render the most effective support to the working peoples' struggle against imperialism, while cementing the unity and might of the socialist community and carrying into practice the communist ideals.

The Chinese leaders are attacking our Party for having worked out a scientifically reasoned plan of communist construction, for laying the accent in the creative activities of the whole Soviet people on the building of the material and technical basis of communism, and for showing constant care for the improvement of the living and cultural standards of all working people in the country. That is truly monstrous and strange. It appears that the Chinese leaders' conception of socialism and communism, their practice of building new society, are very far removed from the Marxist-Leninist theory of scientific communism. Neither Marx nor Lenin had anywhere even remotely hinted that the rockbottom tasks of socialist construction may be realised by the method of "leaps" and cavalry charges, overlooking the degree to which the socio-economic and spiritual premises of the advance have matured and ignoring the task of improving the living standard of the people.

If the Chinese leaders want to impose their practice on us as "universal truth", if they want us to accept for a "model" a society in which violence is idealised and democracy restricted, in which the personality cult thrives and care for the working people is neglected, we will say bluntly: such a "universal truth" and such a "model" do not suit the Soviet people, and, we are sure, will not suit other peoples either.

Socialism, communism, which brings peace, labour, freedom, equality, fraternity and happiness for all the peoples has always been the goal of the communist movement, and will remain so. We follow the theory and practice of scientific communism. We are marching and will always march along the road shown us by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The Chinese leaders have embarked on the dangerous course of undermining Soviet-Chinese friendship and, naturally, we denounce their wrong actions most strongly. The present attitude of the Chinese leaders is having an unfavourable effect on the whole socialist camp and on the communist movement. It is doing great harm to China as well.

As concerns the CPSU and the Soviet Union, we remain true to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and will undeviatingly perform our internationalist duty. We have taken and will continue to take all the necessary measures aimed at normalising Soviet-Chinese relations and strengthening the friendship of our peoples.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue to work for a normalisation of the situation and for a strengthening of friendship between the CPSU and the Communist Party of China. Our Party is deeply convinced that this friendship will exist, grow and flourish.

VI

THE SPLITTING ACTIVITIES OF THE CHINESE LEADERS WITHIN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The Chinese leaders have lately stepped up very noticeably their subversive activities aimed at splitting the world Communist movement, as well as a number of Marxist-Leninist parties. These activities of theirs have acquired an open character; developing on a wide front, they have become particularly subtle and are unprecedented as to the methods used. The CPC leaders have turned the controversy started by them within the world Communist movement into a weapon of direct political struggle against fraternal parties.

The Chinese leaders have apparently decided to carry through to the end their subversive activity against the Leninist unity of the world Communist movement. In recent days they have openly alleged a split to have become "inevitable". In other words, they have now fully revealed their real aims, which they have had in view for a number of years with regard to the world Communist movement.

The Chinese leaders have pushed their factional struggle to a point where they are severing relations with certain Marxist-Leninist parties, which they arbitrarily describe as "non-existent", while giving the name of "parties" to the little groups of splitters they have formed. They have announced for all to hear that they support the factional groups of splitters which they themselves have set up in a number of countries to fight the Marxist-Leninist parties. In other words, the CPC leaders have openly assumed the responsibility for the infamous activities of all those groups and for their struggle against fraternal parties.

The CPC leadership is plainly out to form under its own aegis a sort of separate international bloc and to set it up against the world Communist movement as an instrument for intensifying the struggle against this movement.

The Chinese representatives in international democratic associations have greatly increased their splitting activity and have openly set out to create separate organisations and disrupt the links between the progressive, democratic forces of different countries and different areas of the globe.

The result is that although the Chinese leaders still utter once in a while hypocritical phrases about unity and solidarity, all their practical steps are in fact aimed at shaking and splitting the world Communist movement. Today the policy and activity of the Chinese leaders are the main danger to the unity of the world Communist movement.

It is in this light that we should appraise the publication in two organs of the CC CPC, **Jenminjihpao** and **Hungchi,** on February 4th last, of a factional article directed against the CPSU and the world Communist movement as a whole, an article which is a kind of platform for splitting the revolutionary movement of the working class.

In that article the Chinese leaders allege that the development of the Communist movement proceeds according to the formula: "Unity—struggle, or even a split—a new unity on a new basis." In so doing, they refer to the laws of dialectics. But any Marxist-Leninist will see that these so-called dialectics are no more than a fresh attempt to mask a splitting policy with pseudo-theoretical talk.

Who can speak of an "inevitable" split today? Only those who are breaking with Marxism-Leninism, with the principles of proletarian internationalism. By contrast, those who have the interests of the great cause of the international working class at heart see no objective reasons for a split in the present-day Communist movement. They have a political line tested by the experience of struggle over a long period, a *line* which has brought the working class and the socialist cause such outstanding victories and which enjoys tremendous prestige among the people.

What would a split in the world Communist movement mean in present-day conditions? In our day, such a split would inevitably lead to undermining the unity of the main forces of the world anti-imperialist front—the socialist community, the international working-class movement, the national liberation movement, and the general democratic movements of the peoples. All that would only benefit the aggressive forces of imperialism and would make it easier for them to attack the positions of the world-wide liberation movement. Obviously, anyone who seeks a split is assuming tremendous historical responsibility.

Ever since the world Communist movement came into being the reactionaries all over the world have been making frantic efforts to split its ranks. Today the Chinese leaders are trying to achieve what imperialist reaction has been unable to bring about.

In the light of the present splitting activities of the Chinese leaders, it is now clearer than ever why, at the Meeting of 1960, the CPC delegates insisted so vehemently on excluding from the Statement the passage regarding the impermissibility of factional activity within the world Communist movement. At that time the fraternal parties unanimously rejected that attempt of the Chinese delegation. The Meeting of 1960 said in its Statement that one of the necessary conditions for the Communists achieving their goals is the prevention of all actions likely to undermine the unity of the world Communist movement.

Shortly after the Meeting the Chinese leaders violated that commitment, which they had made together with the other fraternal parties. They even tried—specifically in the article "Workers of All Countries, Unite! Fight Against

Our Common Enemy!" (December 1962)—to put on a "theoretical" basis their refusal to carry out a common decision. They put forward the concept of "majority and minority", which claims that the minority has a right not to comply with collectively adopted decisions and to combat the common line approved. This is nothing but a revision of the fundamental organisational principle of Leninism, for Lenin taught that "only the subordination of the minority to the majority can serve as a principle of the working-class movement" (Coll. Works, Vol. 20, p. 354, Russ. ed.).

The majority to which the Peking leaders are now opposed is a majority comprising Communist parties that have brought the working class of their countries to power and are achieving epoch-making victories for socialism. It is a majority which includes Communist Parties of every single continent and is marching in the van of the revolutionary struggle.

The Chinese leaders are so blinded by their factionalism that they do not hesitate to describe the Marxist-Leninist parties as neither more nor less than a "fictitious" majority.

That device is by no means new. It was first used by splitters against Lenin; they declared boastfully that some day the majority would follow their lead and then they would recognise its will. Lenin wrote about such people that they "recognise the will of the majority of the class-conscious workers, not in the present but in the future in that, and only in the future event of the workers agreeing with them, with the liquidators, Plekhanov and Trotsky." (Coll. Works, Vol. 20, p. 541, Russ. ed.)

It follows that splitters at all times resort to the same kind of stratagems in opposing the will of the majority.

Lately, in fighting against the principle of subordination of the minority to the majority, the CPC leaders have been the first among the opportunists and splitters whom the world Communist movement has ever encountered to put forward the thesis that the existence of several Communist parties in one and the same country is a "legitimate" thing. From what they say these parties should fight not only against the enemies of the working class, but among themselves. There is no need here to refute this thoroughly harmful concept at great length, for every

politically-conscious worker realises that the unity of the class interests and will of the proletariat, and its ideology and class organisation are embodied in a single and solidly united Marxist-Leninist party. Still, it is worth pointing out once again the twists to which the present-day splitters have recourse to bring confusion into the working-class movement and undermine Communist unity.

With that aim in view, they use a patently fraudulent device, by deliberately misinterpreting Lenin's statements. Here is a typical example.

In his well known work "Violation of Unity Under Cover of Cries for Unity," Lenin condemns Trotsky's splitting activities, exposes his calumny against the Bolshevik Party and his attempts to disorganise the workers' movement with his propaganda of insubordination of the minority to the will of the majority of workers. Lenin wrote: "Where the majority of the class-conscious workers have rallied around precise and definite decisions, there we shall find **unity** of opinion and action, there we shall find the Party spirit and a Party... Now by trying to persuade the workers **not to carry out the decisions** of that 'united whole' which the Marxists-Pravdists recognise, Trotsky is trying to disrupt the movement and cause a split". Lenin regarded Trotsky's activities as "splitting tactics, in that it shamelessly flouts the will of the majority of the workers" (Coll. Works, Vol. 20, pp. 310, 312).

The authors of the article published in **Jenminjihpao** and **Hungchi** magazine on February 4, 1964, cite Lenin's article perverting the position of Lenin who always emphasized that the general proletarian discipline should be obligatory for all and demanded that the minority should subordinate to the will of the majority of workers. Trying to disorganize the Communist Parties, the Chinese splitters went as far as an outright forgery.

Furthermore, the Chinese leaders obscure so obvious a point as the necessity for a definite international discipline within the Communist movement. They contend that such a discipline is out of the question since we no longer have a centralised organisation of the Comintern type.

But that is a statement by which the CPC betray themselves, probably unwittingly. They do not realise that international Communist discipline in the present condi-

tions does not imply the execution of orders given by someone on top, but the assumption by the Communist parties—of their own free will and from a keen awareness of their internationalist duty—of definite obligations towards the world Communist movement as a whole and towards one another, as well as the consistent fulfilment of these obligations. This is what prompted the fraternal parties when, in 1960, they pledged themselves in their Statement to adhere strictly to the following principles: to cherish party unity as the apple of their eye; to abide in a spirit of solidarity by the jointly formulated appraisals and conclusions regarding the common tasks to be carried out in the struggle against imperialism for peace, democracy and socialism; to prevent all actions likely to undermine the unity of the world Communist movement; to support one another and respect the independence and equality of all the Marxist-Leninist parties.

Consistent adherence to the collectively expressed will of the world Communist movement is an indication of the Marxist maturity of the party concerned, of its internationalism, for Marxism-Leninism and internationalism are inseparable.

The Chinese leaders' statements on this point are apparently influenced by their general view on discipline, which they regard not as politically-conscious fulfilment of its duty by every contingent of the great alliance of like-minded Communists, but merely as compulsory execution of orders. They are evidently influenced by a practice which is so characteristic of the CPC leaders.

But how foreign that is to the Marxist-Leninist spirit! Lenin, speaking of the Russian Bolsheviks, wrote: "We are proud of the fact that we decide the great questions of the workers' struggle for their emancipation in accordance with the discipline of the international revolutionary proletariat, with due regard to the experience of the workers of different countries, to their knowledge and will, and in this way achieve—in deeds, and not in words as in the case of the Renners, Fritz Adlers and Otto Bauers—unity in the class struggle of the workers for communism throughout the world" (**Coll. Works**, Vol. 31, p. 244, Russ. ed.).

What the Chinese leaders are particularly proud of today is their complete disregard for international Communist discipline, their truly anarchist behaviour both in polemics and in their treatment of fraternal parties.

At present not only the underlying idea of the "theories" spread by the Chinese leaders with a view to justifying their splitting activities, but the main lines along which their activities are developing in practice, and their ways and methods, have become perfectly clear.

The CPC leaders aim their heaviest blows at the strongest and most authoritative contingents of the world communist movement, that is, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist parties of other socialist countries, and the French, Italian and other communist parties. They are out to discredit at all costs all the genuinely Marxist-Leninist parties, which enjoy well-earned respect in the world communist movement and among the masses.

The CC CPC's position on the Communist parties which are waging their struggles in the capitalist countries is particularly outrageous. The Chinese leaders now create many additional difficulties for those parties, which have to work in difficult conditions as it is. They do their best to defame the Marxist-Leninist leadership of those parties and undermine their prestige. They fling at tried and tested leaders of the working class such insulting epithets as "as faint-hearted as mice", "parrots", "double-dealers", and so on.

They say those things about leaders of the parties which have set an example of heroic struggle against fascism, which today march at the head of the struggle against the monopolies and constitute a major national force. They say those things about militant and esteemed comrades who are fighting against heavy odds and are persecuted. Surely one cannot but resent it when they say that the leaders of the US Communist Party "co-operate with the most reckless of the US imperialists", that the Chilean Communists' position "meets the objectives of US imperialism, which wants to maintain its rule in Latin America", that the leadership of the Communist Party of India is no more than a "clique", and so on.

An idea of what Peking means by proletarian solidarity can be gained from the CC CPC's reaction to the Baath nationalists' execution of Salaam Adel and other leaders

of the Communist Party of Iraq. In their interviews with foreign delegations, the Chinese leaders frankly gloated over the atrocious assassination of the Iraqi comrades. Immediately after the Baathist coup d'état they sought contact with the assassins. We now have evidence that the Chinese representatives in Iraq wanted to profit by the fact that the Communist Party of Iraq found itself without a leadership and to form a splitters' group there.

The whole of the Chinese propaganda machine—the New China News Agency, information centres, various bulletins, and radio have now been turned against the Marxist-Leninist parties. The Chinese leaders have in effect opened a new ideological front against fraternal parties. Moreover, they do not mind directly borrowing any device, however base, from the anti-communist arsenal. There is, for example, the falsehood, launched by Chinese propaganda, about the "baton of Moscow" at a wave of which Communist parties are supposed to "turn" one way or the other. This falsehood is an affront both to the fraternal parties which staunchly champion the national interests of their peoples and to the CPSU, to which all interference in the internal affairs of other parties is alien. It is nothing but a new version of that old fable of imperialist propaganda about the "hand of Moscow". In the past it was used against Lenin and the Comintern by Right Social-Democratic leaders. Today it has become a weapon of Peking.

A recent development which may be called the height of the splitting activity of the Chinese leaders is their recruitment of adherents in the ranks of fraternal parties, and the formation of factional groups composed of them. In its letter of June 14, 1963, the CPC leadership already threatened fraternal parties that should they reject the propositions of Peking, they would be superseded by new people who "are or are not members of that party". Facts of recent date show that the Chinese leaders are now carrying out that threat by trying to put the working-class movement in some countries under all sorts of renegades, turncoats and adventurers. The CPC leaders are trying to make the splitters' groups they form out of those renegades their main weapon in the struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties.

To date anti-party groups of renegades and splitters

have been set up, with help and support from Peking, in Belgium, Brazil, Australia, Ceylon, Britain and some other countries. Some of those groups number less than ten members and some others comprise a few dozens of people. This does not, however, embarrass the Chinese leaders, for, on orders from Peking, those groups shout loudly and in unison, pouring lies and slander upon the world Communist movement and the Marxist-Leninist parties. The ringleaders of those groups unexpectedly come into possession of large sums of money. They found newspapers and magazines and begin to publish all manner of slanderous writings, and often open shops of their own to sell Chinese propaganda productions.

The political complexion of the members of those groupings bespeaks the Chinese leaders' complete lack of principle. These as a rule are opportunists, unstable elements expelled from Communist Parties for advocating anti-Marxist views, for factional activity or for immoral behaviour, or ambitious men seeking a career, political "weathercocks" and the like. Members of anti-Party groupings in some countries have displayed rightist opportunist tendencies. There are people with a shady record, and all kinds of adventurers acting in the splitters' groups in Austria, Chile and the United States.

It stands to reason that fraternal parties refuse to put up with factional groups and throw them out of their ranks. Whenever this happens, Peking "takes to task" the fraternal party concerned, which it accuses of neither more nor less than of "using unlawful methods". The Chinese leaders declare expelled splitters to be "true revolutionaries" and "courageous fighters", although all that their "struggle" boils down to is the writing of vociferous "manifestos" against the Communist Party concerned. They make frequent trips to Peking where they are received with great pomp and where their long articles peddling calumnies are published.

The meaning of the clamour raised in Peking over factional groups has become perfectly obvious in recent months. The Chinese leaders have revealed it themselves. A very short time ago they widely advertised a get-together of renegades in Belgium, which termed itself neither more nor less than a "national conference", and passed a ridiculous resolution to "re-establish (sic!) the Communist

Party of Belgium" and "condemn the anti-Party behaviour of the former (sic!) Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium". As for the Chinese leaders, they base themselves on that fiction to describe the Central Committee of the Communist Party of. Belgium elected by the Party Congress as the "former" CC, as if it were Peking and not the working class of the country concerned that founded its Communist party. In the same way the CPC leaders "abolished" the central committees of certain other communist parties, such as that of Ceylon.

We must say plainly that there has never been anything like that in the history of the communist movement. It has never occurred to a Communist party to declare wretched groups of splitters expelled from another Communist party to be the real Party and to describe the real Communist Party as a "has-been". The Chinese leaders, who talk so loudly about equality and non-interference by parties in one another's internal affairs, today lay claim to the role of "supreme judges" in the communist movement who shall decide for the Communist parties concerned matters bearing on their internal life.

The splitters' groups set up by Peking have no roots in the working-class movement and in the general democratic struggle of the masses, nor can they have any. They are outside the world communist movement and no politically-conscious worker will ever agree to have anything to do with them. They have been brought into existence in an absolutely artificial manner, being a product of the splitting activities of Peking. It should be noted that their rise has been very well received by the ruling circles of the capitalist countries, which rightly see them as a gratuitous "fifth column" in the working-class movement.

At present the CC CPC leadership is carrying things further, plainly intending to form, in contrast to the world communist movement, a bloc of its fellow-thinkers that will have its own platform and group discipline, and with its centre in Peking. These plans were given away as early as the end of 1962 by Mehmet Shehu, who said that "today a bloc of parties loyal to Marxism-Leninism is being formed with the Chinese Party leading".

Why is that bloc being set up? Anyone should realise that its aim is not to fight for the objectives of the working-class movement against world imperialism, for the

very idea of the bloc contains the seeds of a split and, consequently, of a weakening of the working class. That bloc is being set up to fight against the Marxist-Leninist parties, against the world communist movement, for the benefit of the special aims of the CC CPC leadership.

The Chinese leaders have extended their policy of splitting the world communist movement to the international front of the democratic forces. For several years already they have been using the congresses and conferences of peace fighters and of women's, youth and other international associations for disruptive sorties. This was the case at the Conference of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation, the Women's Congress in Moscow, the session of the World Peace Council in Warsaw, and at other international forums. Juggling with "revolutionary phrases", the Chinese leaders try to impose on all those organisations tasks and functions alien to them, to discredit and declare unnecessary the principal slogans and demands which gave rise to those democratic movements. Obviously, the Chinese representatives' sectarian position is directed towards alienating from those movements very large sections of the population which hold different views, and towards narrowing the mass basis of the general democratic struggle.

Comrades, the world communist movement has become the most influential political force of today. In waging a grim struggle against imperialist reaction, for the interests of the working class and all working people, for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism, it has made great progress, considerably increased its membership and scored outstanding victories. The post-war period has seen the rise of dozens of new Communist parties and today there is not a corner on the globe where Communists are not spreading the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism among the people. The last decade has been particularly eventful for the world communist movement. It is in this decade that the movement has, in eliminating the harmful effects of the personality cult, become much more active in its creative thought and practical work, which it has brought even closer to reality, to the needs and expectations of the mass of the people.

Against that historical background, the harm of the splitting activities of the Chinese leaders, as well as the ut-

ter hopelessness of their attempts to lead world communism astray from its Leninist path and to make it subservient to their own designs, are particularly obvious.

It would be wrong, however, to underrate the danger of the factional activities of the CC CPC. The Chinese leaders pin their hopes on all sorts of immature and unstable elements, and also on those who are unaffected by the new spirit which has permeated the communist movement during the last decade, and who cling to the practices of the personality cult and are in thrall to patterns of dogmatism and doctrinairism implanted by it.

The Chinese leadership's factional methods are also adopted by all manner of renegades and turncoats, who are willing to fight against communism under any flag.

Furthermore, the Chinese leaders clearly want to profit by the real discontent of the people at the anti-popular, reactionary policies of the ruling classes of the capitalist countries. In our day, when hundreds upon hundreds of millions of people, including people who are at sea in politics and lack experience, are joining in an active political struggle, the "ultra-Left" revolutionary phrases in which the Chinese leaders couch their adventurous concepts are likely to bring a certain response. This applies, above all, to those countries where there is no industrial proletariat or where it is small, and where petty-bourgeois ideology exercises considerable influence, while the theoretical maturity of revolutionary leaders is not always up to the mark.

To disguise their anti-Leninist line and their splitting activities, the Chinese leaders used the flag of the struggle against "modern revisionism". They put the label of "revisionists" on the Marxist-Leninist parties, while exalting themselves to the rank of the "genuine" revolutionaries. They expect that they can in this way mislead people who are unfamiliar with the true history of the struggle of the world communist movement against Right and "Left" opportunism, and are inclined to assimilate superficial patterns of revolutionary struggle rather than to master the substance of our great doctrine.

We know well from the history of the communist movement that irresponsible accusations of revisionism have repeatedly been levelled at the proponents of creative Marxism by all kinds of dogmatists and petty-bourgeois revolutionaries. In the autumn of 1920, for example, G. Gorter, a

Dutch "Left" Communist expelled from the Comintern, wrote in his Open Letter to Lenin, in reply to Lenin's book **"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder:** "You and the Third International are now doing what Social-Democrats did in the past... In accordance with the development of the working-class movement in Western Europe, there exist two trends: radical and opportunist. You, however, Comrade Lenin, support the opportunist trend... From a Marxist leader you are turning into an opportunist leader."

How many people recall today those wretched sallies against the greatest revolutionary in world history?

The methods used by the Chinese splitters cannot deceive the Marxists-Leninists of the world. The absolute majority of these parties has openly condemned the anti-Leninist, adventurous policy of the leaders of the CC CPC. Numerous documents, statements by prominent leaders of the world communist movement, and the Party press have strongly criticised the harmful propositions and factional, disruptive actions of the Chinese leaders. All this means that, taken as a whole, the world Communist movement today adheres to the only position that is correct, namely, the Marxist-Leninist position.

Our Party, which was reared by Lenin, will continue, together with the other fraternal parties, to fight unrelentingly against all opportunist actions both from the right and from the "left", for the unity of the fraternal parties and all the contingents of the world revolutionary movement, and for the purity of the victorious Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

VII

THE DANGER OF THE PETTY-BOURGEOIS, NATIONALIST, NEO-TROTSKYITE DEVIATION

Soviet Communists, as all other Marxists-Leninists in the world, cannot limit themselves to a criticism and political assessment of the erroneous, anti-Leninist views of the CPC leadership. Each of us inevitably asks the question: How has it happened that the leaders of a party like the CPC, which has considerable experience of revolutionary struggle and of building a new society, have taken the

road of struggle against the world communist movement? Who are we dealing with in the person of the CPC leadership?

The experience of our Party and of the whole international working-class movement shows that on many occasions Leninism had come to grips with views and propositions such as are being trumpeted by the Chinese leadership. Naturally, the present advocates of these views do not simply repeat what their predecessors said. They adapt old ideas to new conditions and to their own requirements.

Lenin, as we know, pointed out that Bolshevism grew, gained strength and became steeled chiefly in the struggle against Right-wing opportunism. "This was," he wrote, "naturally, the principal enemy of Bolshevism within the working-class movement". At the same time he emphasised the importance of another aspect of the experience of Bolshevism, about which. he noted. much too little was known abroad. "Bolshevism," he wrote in **Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder,** "grew up, took shape and became steeled in long years of struggle against **petty-bourgeois revolutionism,** which smacks of, or borrows something from anarchism and which falls short in anything essential, of the conditions and requirements of a consistent proletarian class struggle" (Coll. Works. Vol. 31. pp. 15-16).

It is noteworthy that the Chinese leaders, who relevantly and irrelevantly love to refer to examples of past ideological differences and draw historical parallels, pass over in complete silence this aspect of Bolshevik experience. That is not accidental for each world that Lenin directed against representatives of petty-bourgeois revolutionism or, as he ironically called it, petty-bourgeois "revolutionarism", is directed at the present ideological and political concepts and propositions of the CPC leadership.

An all sided characteristic is given of petty-bourgeois revolutionism in Lenin's numerous works, in the decisions of our Party and in the documents of the Communist International. Lenin saw its sources in the special position of the petty proprietor, who easily goes over to "extreme revolutionism" but is unable to display self-control, organisation, discipline and staunchness and is inclined to dash from one extreme to another.

Everybody knows of the struggle Bolshevism waged against the Socialist-Revolutionaries, a party "which more

than any other," as Lenin noted, "expressed the tendencies of petty-bourgeois revolutionism" (Coll. Works, Vol. 31, p. 16). We cannot help but recall that the Socialist-Revolutionaries rejected the idea that the working class plays the leading role and tried to prove that the peasant movement is the really socialist movement.

From time to time, particularly during sharp turns in history, petty-bourgeois vacillation made itself felt in the ranks of the proletarian parties as well. Lenin repeatedly pointed out that the proletariat was not insured against the penetration of petty-bourgeois ideology and prejudices into its ranks. Joining the proletarian parties the best of the petty-bourgeois revolutionaries re-educate themselves, seriously study Marxism and in the end become true revolutionaries. Others are either too slow or unable to adopt anything from the proletarian party "except a few texts and 'striking' slogans learnt by heart..." (Coll. Works, Vol. 16, pp. 44-45).

Our Party had to combat "leftist" petty-bourgeois vacillation most of all after power was seized, during the early years of the development of the Soviet state. We know the relentless struggle that Lenin waged against "Left-wing Communists", the "workers' opposition", Trotskyism and the "ultra-leftist" trend in the then young communist movement.

Allow me to remind you of the struggle against "Left-wing Communists" in the period the Brest Peace was concluded, when they attempted to foist upon the Soviet Republic the disastrous adventurist tactics of a "revolutionary war". Lenin held that despite their clamourous revolutionary verbiage, the "Left-wing Communists" based their views on stark pessimism and utter desperation *(Coll. Works, Vol. 27. p. 51, Russ. ed.)*. As regards the objective role played by the "Left-wing Communists" at that time, Lenin, addressing them, said bluntly: "By your objective role you are the weapon of imperialist provocation. While your subjective 'psychology' is that of an infuriated petty bourgeois who swaggers and boasts and yet is fully aware that the proletariat is right..." (Coll. Works, Vol. 27, p. 297, Russ. ed.).

In the situation that has now arisen in the international communist movement special mention must be made of the acute struggle that our Party waged against Trotskyism.

Trotskyism was a clearly expressed petty-bourgeois deviation. It gave itself out as being a more "leftist", more "revolutionary" trend than Bolshevism. While declaring themselves the "true" champions of the world revolution, Trotsky and his supporters in actual fact opposed Leninism. Moreover, Trotskyism embodied a renunciation of the Bolshevik partisanship, of the unity of its ranks. Factionalism comprised the "soul" of Trotskyism. The Trotskyites joined not only with the small factional groups within the Comintern but also with organisations, groups and individuals that had never belonged to Communist parties, and also with enemies and traitors expelled from their ranks.

Do we have to recall all these facts? Yes, comrades, we have to, in order to take into account the lessons of past struggles against Leninism.

Do the Chinese theoreticians' present concepts not remind us of many of the ideas of the petty-bourgeois trends that were crushed by Leninism long ago? Only a petty-bourgeois "ultra"-revolutionary can regard the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems as a "renunciation" of the struggle against imperialism, a "rejection" of the revolution. He alone welcomes the thesis of the "revolutionary war" being the "last, decisive means" of putting an end to the contradiction between two social systems. Only a petty-bourgeois "super"-revolutionary can demand that revolution be started "at once" and "everywhere" without taking into account concrete conditions and the balance of forces. Nobody except him can oppose the utilisation of the peaceful road of revolution because his only criterion of "revolutionism" is the use of force regardless of whether circumstances reguire it or not.

It is quite understandable that having steered this course, the Chinese leaders have naturally come down to borrowing many of their ideas and concepts from the ideological arsenal of Trotskyism in the same way as they have inherited from it their factional, splitting methods of struggle against Marxist-Leninist parties.

Yes, comrades, it must be said openly that the entire range of the CPC leadership's theoretical and political views are in many ways a rehash of Trotskyism, which has long ago been thrown overboard by the international revolutionary movement.

What in actual fact are the views of the Chinese leaders on the questions of war and peace? Nothing but a repetition under new conditions of the Trotskyite slogan of "neither war nor peace".

Or take the CC CPC leadership's active opposition to economic competition with capitalism. Is there anything new in it? No, it is merely a repetition of the Trotskyite old line of rejecting peaceful economic development and going over to the tactics of "revolutionary war", of "pushing on" the world revolution by armed force.

Everybody knows that such was the real meaning behind the Trotskyite theory of "permanent revolution". The struggle against Trotskyism on this issue was of historic significance. The destiny of the world's first Land of Socialism, the destiny of the entire world revolutionary movement depended on the outcome of this struggle. What would have happened if our Party adopted that line? It would have found itself helpless in the face of world imperialism and would have fallen easy prey to it in the event of an armed attack.

Properly speaking, the Chinese leaders are now foisting on us a dispute over the same question of whether to take the road of "revolutionary" adventures or to adhere to the Leninist policy of strengthening the economic and political might of the world system of socialism and developing the revolutionary movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation struggle of the peoples with full consideration for Lenin's theory of the revolution being the result of the aggravation of internal class contradictions in each country.

The kinship with Trotskyism is no less striking also in the Chinese theses on the danger of "bourgeois degeneration" in the socialist countries. In reply to these fabrications we can say that they are not new, that our Party has heard them before. They are a repetition under new conditions of the Trotskyite slander about the "degeneration" of the USSR into a "Thermidor" state.

Besides, do we not find features of Trotskyism in the Chinese concepts which exaggerate the role of force, of coercion in the revolution and in the building of socialism?

Furthermore, compare the views of the CPC leaders with the "ideas" of modern Trotskyism. Perhaps some people might think that the Chinese theory about the regions of

Asia, Africa and Latin America being the "main zone of the storms of the world revolution" is new? No, it is almost a literal repetition of one of the basic theses of present Trotskyism. The decisions of the so-called IVth (Trotskyite) International contain the words: "...As a result of the successive defeats of the two major revolutionary waves in 1919-23 and 1943-48 and the weaker wave of 1934-37, the focus of the world revolution has for the present shifted to the colonial world."

That is the source of the Chinese leadership's political wisdom.

In the writings of modern Trotskyites one can find other "ultra"-revolutionary phrases, which are almost word for word reproduced by the Chinese press and given out as so-called "revolutionary principles". "Peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems," the Trotskyites vociferate, "is not only impossible but also harmful to the working class of all countries" because it helps "to strengthen the positions of capitalism and weakens the positions of socialism". They boastfully declare that "only the person who is fearlessly prepared to face the consequences of the nuclear war being hatched by capitalism can be considered a true revolutionary" and so on and so forth.

After this is it surprising that in addressing the CPC leaders the ring-leaders of modern Trotskyism say to them (as was said last July by Posadas, one of the heads of Trotskyism in Latin America): "Comrades Chinese, you have no right to maintain that all the questions you are putting forward as revolutionary conclusions are the result of solely your theoretical and political works. They are the conclusions of the IVth International."

Small wonder that the Trotskyites openly link up their hopes for a revival of their long-withered movement with the present political line of the Chinese leadership. "The political stand taken by the Communist Party of China," states the so-called "Manifesto" of the sixth congress of their "International", "indicates tremendous possibilities, which open a field of activity that Trotskyism never had before."

The Chinese leaders pretend they do not notice all this. They have evidently reasoned along the following lines: "Present-day Trotskyism is a little known trend and we can implement its ideas by giving them a 'Sinified' form". But you cannot hide a cat in a bag. No matter how the Chinese leadership strive to conceal the real source of their ideas they cannot hide the coincidence of their views with those of old and modern Trotskyism.

Like the Trotskyites, the Chinese leaders are demanding freedom for factions and groupings in the communist movement and using their methods for subversive activity in the movement. Does anyone think we cannot recognise in the malicious personal attacks of Chinese propaganda against leaders of the CPSU and the Communist parties of France, Italy, the USA, India and other countries the familiar "method" of the Trotskyites, who dreamed of finding ways of casting still more vicious slander at popular leaders of the working class?

The modern Trotskyites do not hide their jubilation over these actions of the CPC leaders. In a statement published in Paris at the end of July of last year, the joint secretariat of the Trotskyite "International" assured the Chinese leaders that it "would support them" in the struggle against the CPSU and also against the Indian, US, French, Italian and other Communist parties. At a meeting in the summer of 1963 the Executive Committee of this "International" issued a special resolution approving the "historical mission of joining the Chinese and working for a united front between the IVth International and the Chinese comrades".

These facts speak eloquently for themselves. The logic of their struggle with the CPSU and the world communist movement has brought the CPC leaders into a still closer alliance with Trotskyism, that bitterest enemy of Marxism-Leninism.

One must say that at one time the Chinese leaders themselves saw the danger of petty-bourgeois pressure on the Communist Party of China. "Our Party," Mao Tse-tung, for example, said, "is not only surrounded by this broad social stratum from without, but people with a petty-bourgeois background form a huge majority within it as well... Petty-bourgeois ideology of all shades frequently finds expression in our Party." (Mao Tse-tung, Vol. 4, pp. 386-387.) In the CPC, he said elsewhere, petty-bourgeois ideology finds expression in "dashing now to the left, now to the right, in a weakness for leftist revolutionary verbiage and slogans, in sectarian exclusiveness and adventurism".

The Chinese leaders used to be right in what they wrote. But now they have ceased talking about the danger of pet-

ty-bourgeois degeneration. Is it because petty-bourgeois ideology has taken the upper hand in their own views, in their political line, in the methods of their activity?

Yet in a country like China, as in tsarist Russia, with its huge preponderance of non-proletarian strata among the population, Communists must be especially vigilant with regard to the penetration of petty-bourgeois views and traditions into the ranks of the working class. Under Lenin's leadership our Party successfully coped with this task. From its very inception it was a party of the militant working class, which was linked up with large-scale industry and had extensive training in the proletarian class struggle. The fact that Lenin and the Bolsheviks drew on the experience of the entire international working-class movement and firmly adhered to the principles and ideals of the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels was of fundamental importance.

The CPC leaders evidently lack sufficient Marxist-Leninist steeling to firmly repel the pressure of petty-bourgeois elements and uphold the line of proletarian socialism. This alone can explain the fact that petty-bourgeois ideology has made an imprint both on their internal and foreign policy.

We would not have liked to touch upon the question of the CPC leadership's home policy. But we have to talk about it because the adventurist line of the Chinese leaders in the international arena is linked up with their mistakes in domestic policy.

Marxists-Leninists of all countries now know the results of the so-called policy of the "big leap" and people's communes. One cannot fail to see in this policy "leftist" attempts to "leap" over necessary stages of social development.

Our Party has always paid tribute to the experience of the Chinese Communists in implementing democratic and socialist transformations after the triumph of the Revolution.In the period 1949-57, when it pursued a realistic line, utilised the experience of the other socialist countries and relied on their support, the Communist Party of China achieved considerable successes in promoting China's economic, social and political development. Soviet people sincerely rejoiced over these successes.

But in 1958 this line was suddenly revised and replaced with the so-called policy of "three red banners—a general line, the big leap and the people's communes". The Chinese

leaders decided to carry out in several years the tasks for which back in 1956 it was felt three or more five-year plans were needed. It was decided to increase the total industrial product 6.5 times (under a mean annual increase rate of 45 per cent!) and the total agricultural output 2.5 times (under a mean annual increase rate of 20 per cent!) in five years (1958-62).

These plans were drawn up without any economic substantiation whatsoever, without taking the country's real possibilities into account. The people's communes that were set up in the countryside had the job of ensuring the "leap to communism" in 3-4 or 5-6 years.

Everybody knows what came of these experiments. The CPR's economy found itself hurled several years back. The line of the "three red banners" led to a serious disorganisation of the entire national economy, to a sharp retardation of the rate of industrialisation and affected the people's standard of living.

In saying this, we are, naturally, not gloating over the failures of the Chinese Communists. Like them we are grieved over the difficulties that have fallen to the lot of the fraternal Chinese people. Our sole purpose in speaking of these facts is to show what a departure from tested Leninist principles of socialist construction leads to.

In analyzing the present positions of the Chinese leadership one cannot fail to see that they also stem from the increasing openly nationalistic, great-power aspirations that are particularly striking in the foreign policy of the CPC leaders. History knows of many cases when vociferous "revolutionarism" leagued together with the most blatant nationalism. Lenin pointed out time and again that the social and economic conditions engendering the petty proprietor impart especial stability to one of "the most deep-seated of petty-bourgeois prejudices, namely: prejudices of national egoism, of national narrow-mindedness" (Coll. Works, Vol. 31, p. 128, Russ. ed.).

Facts show that nationalism is inexorably gaining the upper hand in the entire policy of the Chinese leaders, that it is becoming the mainspring of their actions. This manifested itself during the period of the "big leap", which was obviously planned as an attempt "in a single leap" to overtake all the socialist countries and occupy a dominating position in the world socialist system.

Later these tendencies began to gain ever greater momentum. This found expression in such actions of the Chinese Government as the artificial fanning of nationalistic passions around frontier issues, the behaviour of the CPC leaders during the Caribbean crisis and the stand of the Chinese Government in the nuclear problem.

These and other facts reveal the complete discrepancy between what the Chinese leaders say and do. It is becoming increasingly clear that the "leftist" verbiage and prescriptions are intended solely for "export", for imposing on the Communist parties of other countries. As for themselves, when matters concern practical steps in the international arena, the CPC leaders prefer to act by no means from positions of a revolutionary struggle against imperialism. It is extremely surprising why at present Chinese propaganda reduces the entire struggle against imperialism solely to a struggle with the USA, by-passing its allies—the Japanese, West German and French imperialists. Are they looking for partners among the monopolistic groups of these countries for the struggle against what they term as "modern revisionism"?

Great suspicion is evoked by the Chinese leaders' so-called theory of an "intermediate zone", which regards West Germany, Britain, France and Japan as countries held in thraldom by US imperialism, thereby embellishing the imperialists of Britain, France, Japan and, in particular, West Germany, glossing over their aggressive nature and the threat they constitute for the socialist countries, the national liberation movement and world peace. The 1960 Statement lays stress on the special threat to the cause of peace from West-German imperialism and sets the Communist parties the task intensifying the struggle against its aggressive aspirations. From their own experience the Soviet people know how dangerous this imperialist vulture is. FRG imperialism is no longer a mere satellite of American imperialism. Relying on a huge economic potential, which considerably exceeds the potential possessed by the whole of nazi Germany, West-German imperialism has created a large war machine and is increasingly setting the tone in Nato.

British, French and Japanese imperialism are likewise exceedingly dangerous. This is seen from, say, the example of recent events in Cyprus, in East Africa, Gabon and South-East Asia, where the British and French imperialists are

resorting to armed force to suppress the national liberation movement.

The CPSU holds that side by side with a determined struggle against US imperialism, the major international exploiter and gendarme, all anti-imperialist forces must also carry on a struggle against the aggressive, reactionary forces of British, French, West-German and Japanese imperialism. The Chinese theory of an "intermediate zone", on the other hand, objectively whitewashes the imperialists of Britain, France, West Germany and Japan, for whom this is advantageous.

It must be said that the ruling circles of the imperialist powers have "got the measure" of the secret of Chinese policy. They have understood that the "revolutionary phrase-mongering" of the Chinese leaders is not at all directed against imperialism. In effect, the purpose of this phrase-mongering is to screen a savage struggle against the CPSU and the world Communist movement and in no way threatens the imperialists. That accounts for the change that has come about in the policy of the leading capitalist states with regard to China.

We shall not hide the fact that in following all these manoeuvres of the Chinese leaders, we, like all other Marxists-Leninists in the world, are justifiably alarmed at the dangerous path onto which the Chinese leaders are dragging their great country. It is quite likely that in following their erroneous, anti-Leninist line, the Chinese leaders will virtually land themselves in the same boat with reactionary, bellicose elements of imperialism, as has already happened in connection with the CPR Government's refusal to sign the Moscow partial test-ban treaty.

The nationalist policy of the CPC leaders has nothing in common with the actual national interests of the fraternal Chinese nation. Most of all, it is the peoples of the socialist countries that can be sincere allies of the peoples of China. The peoples of China have a vested interest in the consolidation of the world socialist system, in an enduring alliance with all the anti-imperialist forces. In that lies the earnest of the rapid advance of People's China along the socialist road.

It is impossible to comprehend the present policy of the CC CPC both in the country and internationally, unless it is viewed in the context of the situation within the Com-

munist Party of China and in the country itself that has arisen due to the personality cult. It must not be overlooked that the Mao Tse-tung personality cult is having an increasingly negative effect on the activities of the Chinese Communist Party.

For many years Chinese propaganda has been drumming it into everybody's head that Mao Tse-tung's ideas are the "supreme embodiment of Marxism-Leninism" and that our epoch is the "epoch of Mao Tse-tung". As it asserts that the brunt of generalising the historical tasks of our time has fallen completely upon the shoulders of Mao Tse-tung alone, Chinese propaganda claims that Mao Tse-tung's ideas are the Marxism-Leninism of our epoch, "the scientific theory of socialist revolution and the building of socialism and communism".

It is now perfectly clear that the CPC leadership is striving to spread the Mao Tse-tung personality cult to the whole world communist movement, so that the leader of the CPC should, like Stalin in his day, sit aloft like God above all the Marxist-Leninist parties and settle arbitrarily all matters of their policy and work. The ideology and practice of the personality cult largely explain the appearance of hegemonic ambitions among the Chinese leaders.

But history does not repeat itself. What has once been a tragedy will be no more than a farce if it occurs a second time. The CPC leaders ought to know that the communist movement will never allow the personality cult, which is alien to Marxism-Leninism, to recur, for it has paid for it so dearly in the past. The communist movement and the personality cult are incompatible.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU has put an end to this alien to Marxism-Leninism phenomenon in our Party once and for all, and has created conditions in which the things that occurred in the personality cult period can never reoccur.

The Party has completely restored the Leninist principles in Party and state affairs. It has restored and developed the principles of socialist democracy. The course charted by the 20th Congress of the CPSU was fully supported in the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow Meetings. It is clear, therefore, that denouncing the struggle against the personality cult ideology is tantamount to departing from the agreed line of the communist movement, that it is tantamount to prodding the communist movement deliberately towards an incorrect path, a path foreign to Marxism-Leninism and the nature of the socialist system.

Yet that is exactly what the Chinese leaders are doing. They have openly undertaken the defence of the Stalin personality cult and have declared that fighting against it means "overthrowing Marxism-Leninism" and "stigmatising the dictatorship of the proletariat".

However, it is the personality cult that leads to perversions of important aspects in the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the highest form of democracy, a democracy for the working people. Under Lenin the democratic principles of party and state life and socialist legality were always strictly observed. He fought against anti-party groups and trends with Party methods, leaning for support on the Party rank-and-file. A different method predominated during the Stalin personality cult period—a method of physical reprisals against all Party workers whom Stalin suspected of disagreeing with his views. What is more, the abuse and reprisals against tested and faithful Party and government workers were particularly strong at a time when the struggle against the opposition was over and socialism had won. Stalin turned the vanquishing sword of the dictatorship of the proletariat, intended to deal blows at the enemies, against the cadres of the Communist Party and the socialist state.

But it is evidently this very aspect of Stalin's activities that the Chinese leaders like most—since they identify his incorrect methods of leadership with the dictatorship of the proletariat. In spite of the now widely known numerous facts with regard to Stalin's abuse of power during the personality cult period, in spite of Stalin's departure from Lenin's precepts in certain important issues, the Chinese leaders place Stalin on a pedestal, depicting him as the "great continuer" of Lenin's cause. The Chinese leaders speak and write about the wholesale reprisals of the personality cult period as though they were no more than slight "excesses".

This policy of the Chinese leaders augurs no good to the people. It bears evidence of an ideology and the moral make-up of people who bank on methods of violence and suppression, rather than of Marxists and Leninists. The Chinese leaders ought to ask the Soviet Communists, the workers, peasants and the intelligentsia who experienced the deplor-

able consequences of the personality cult what they think of the attempts to vindicate the perversions and mistakes made by Stalin and of restoring the personality cult. They would get only one answer: we shall not let it happen again!

Our Party has smashed the anti-Party Molotov, Kaganovich and Malenkov group. This group resisted the abolition of the personality cult and of its consequences chiefly because some of its members were also responsible for the wholesale persecution of guiltless people at a time when they stood at the country's helm together with Stalin.

The unlawful abuse by Stalin and the members of the anti-Party group, subsequently exposed, inflicted upon prominent leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, has now come to light. But that is not all. It has been learned that Molotov, together with Stalin, issued orders that the wives of these leaders should be sentenced to the supreme penalty under the so-called "List No. 4 of the Wives of the Enemies of the People", listing the names of V. A. Dybenko-Sedyakina, E. S. Kosior, A. I. Chubar, E. E. Eikhe-Rubtsova, etc. In many cases, Molotov tried, as the saying goes, to be "more Catholic than the Pope". In one of the documents, which endorsed long prison terms for a large group of wives of repressed functionaries, Molotov put down "supreme penalty" against one of the names in the list.

Is it to restore such inhuman practices that the Chinese leaders are so concerned about? Is that why they show such sympathy for people who have been expelled from our Party?

In the matter of the personality cult the Chinese leaders have departed not only from the conclusions and propositions of the world communist movement, but also from their own previous declarations.

It may be recalled that in 1956 and 1957 Mao Tse-tung and Liu Shao-chi in their speeches, and articles about the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat approved by the Political Bureau of the CC CPC, highly commended the efforts of the CPSU to eliminate the effects of the personality cult. At the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1957, Mao Tse-tung said: "In the last four or five years after Stalin's death the situation has improved considerably in the Soviet Union both in the sphere of domestic policy and foreign policy. This shows that the line represented by Comrade Khrushchov is more

correct and that the opposition to this line is incorrect." At that time the Chinese leaders rightly said that none but "the reactionaries of the whole world" could oppose the line of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

Yet now the Chinese leaders are defending the personality cult in pursuance of their own political designs. They are defending Stalin's distortions and mistakes largely because they are themselves implanting the Mao Tse-tung personality cult.

The present political line of the CPC leaders again shows the world communist movement and the politically conscious workers of the whole world how pernicious the practices of the personality cult had been and still are, and what harm they inflict to the interests of the peoples, to the great struggle against imperialism, for socialism. The assertion of the personality cult ideology in the communist movement would lead it into a cul-de-sac and do grave harm to the socialist and communist cause.

Therefore, an examination of the sources of the present anti-Leninist dissentive policy of the CPC leadership leads up to the conclusion that the world communist movement faces a tangible danger of petty-bourgeois nationalist deviation that disguises itself with "Left" phrase-mongering. The danger of this deviation is all the greater, because we are dealing with leaders of a party in power which disposes of a large machinery of state and of means of mass ideological indoctrination.

It is clear that the CPSU, like all the other Marxist-Leninist parties, cannot but take measures in order to attenuate as much as possible the harm that this petty-bourgeois deviation may inflict on the world communist movement.

VIII

FOR UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT ON THE BASIS OF MARXIST-LENINIST PRINCIPLES

Comrades, our Party has every right to say that we have been, and are, doing everything in our power to overcome the differences in order to restore co-operation between the CPC and the CPSU, to reinforce the friendship

between the CPR and the Soviet Union and to cement the unity of the world communist movement. In spite of the intolerable methods of debate used by the leaders of the CPC, in spite of their open struggle against the CPSU and other fraternal parties, our Party has shown the maximum of restraint, the maximum sense of responsibility, and the maximum of care for the cohesion of the communist ranks.

In the last few years, acting on the initiative of Comrade Khrushchov, the CC CPSU and the Soviet Government undertook many practical measures aimed at cementing our parties and at preserving and expanding co-operation with the CPR in the political, economic, scientific, technical and cultural spheres. If these measures have failed to yield results, the blame for it rests entirely with the Chinese leaders.

When the Chinese leaders began their unveiled attacks on our Party, the CC CPSU addressed letters a few times to the CC CPC, in which it pointed out that the rockbottom interests of the socialist and communist cause requires that our Parties should, as before, in spite of the existing differences, carry through an agreed policy in all matters of principle. We suggested stopping the senseless arguments over questions which we understand differently, and not making any public statements, which only tend to deepen the differences. The letters put forward concrete proposals envisaging co-ordinated actions in world affairs, greater exchange of foreign policy information and agreed conduct in the international democratic organisations, etc.

In October 1962, Comrade Khrushchov asked the Chinese Ambassador to the USSR, who was going home, to tell the Chinese leaders that we are offering them to "abandon all arguments and differences, to stop discussing who is right and who is wrong, to let sleeping dogs lie, and to begin our relations over again with a clean slate".

Although the Chinese press had by then published a whole series of articles containing gross attacks on the CPSU and other fraternal parties, Comrade Khrushchov declared in a conversation with the new Chinese Ambassador in January 1963 that "we want to come back to our previous fraternal relations and are ready to do everything for this purpose".

But every time the leaders of the CPC responded to these acts of good will on the part of the Central Committee of

our Party with deliberate actions aimed at adding to the differences, and mounted fresh attacks on the CPSU, the Soviet Government and the "common policy" of the world communist movement.

In the struggle against the CPSU and its Leninist policy, the Chinese leaders are concentrating their assault most of all on Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov. To be sure, they cannot fail to see that it is Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov who stands in the van of the wonderful processes that have sprung up in our Party and country after the 20th Congress and that ensure the successful progress of the Soviet people to communism. That is why they would like to isolate Comrade Khrushchov from the Central Committee for their subversive ends and to oppose our Central Committee to the Party and the Soviet people.

But this foul plan is adventurist and hopeless, and doomed to complete and ignominious failure.

The Chinese leaders, and not they alone, should put it in their pipes and smoke it that our Central Committee headed by Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov, that loyal Leninist, has never been so united and monolithic as now.

Comrade Khrushchov with his inexhaustible energy, his truly Bolshevist devotion and sense of principle, is the recognised leader of our Party and our people. He expresses the most cherished thoughts and aspirations of the Soviet people. The Leninist line pursued by our Party cannot be separated from the Central Committee, from Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov. This line has elevated our country's world prestige to unprecedented heights, it has elevated its prestige in the eyes of the working people of the whole world. This Leninist line is supported wholeheartedly by all the Communists and all the people of our land.

Our Party has never evaded ideological struggle before, and does not evade it now. But it believes that ideological differences should be settled along Leninist principles and that the development of polemics should be subordinated to the interests of the working-class movement.

The CC CPSU was keenly aware of the danger emanating from the Chinese leaders' intention to turn open polemics from a means of ironing out questions in dispute into an excuse for piling up absurd, slanderous charges, into an instrument of ideological and political struggle against the communist movement.

Together with the other Marxist-Leninist parties our Party has applied considerable effort to terminate the open polemics forced upon us by the CPC leaders. It may be recalled that the CC CPSU has come forward repeatedly with initiatives to that effect—notably in January 1963, in the speech of Comrade Khrushchov, First Secretary of the CC CPSU, at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. This initiative was backed by the overwhelming majority of Marxist-Leninist parties. But the Chinese leadership refused to discuss this proposal and saw fit to expand the set of questions in dispute, to aggravate and provoke the polemics.

Last spring an agreement was reached on a bilateral meeting of CPSU and CPC representatives. We hoped that at this meeting the Chinese comrades would be ready to concentrate efforts not on what divides us, but on what unites the CPC with the CPSU and with other fraternal parties. The CPSU delegation suggested that all questions in dispute be discussed in an earnest and thorough manner, in order to clear the path for a normalisation of relations, to cement the unity of our Parties and of the world communist movement as a whole. We submitted a concrete programme for the development of relations between the USSR and the CPR.

But the CPC delegation took advantage of the meeting to make the differences still more acute and to mount violent and groundless attacks on the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. After reading prepared statements, which completely ignored our arguments and proposals, the Chinese delegates called for a break in the bilateral meeting.

All the measures taken by the CC CPSU were prompted by a sincere desire to strengthen the unity of the Marxist-Leninist parties and the cohesion of the socialist countries. It was up to us to use all the available opportunities in order to squash the differences and prevent a split, and not be carried away by the heat of the struggle.

Yet the Chinese leadership apparently understood these measures of ours differently. It became all too clear that they misunderstood our restraint, our urge for unity, as a show of weakness. Lately, they have begun saying that they would not agree to any improvement of relations with

the CPSU, unless it comes about on the basis of our "unconditional surrender". What do the Chinese leaders want?

In substance, they want the Communist movement to retreat from its positions in all the basic problems of our times.

The world Communist movement considers it vitally necessary to make the most of the present situation for a progressively close unification of all the revolutionary forces of our time and for the further development of the world revolutionary process.

In contrast to this the Chinese leaders have set their sights on dividing the main revolutionary forces of our time—the world socialist system, the international working class, and the national liberation movement. This can only act as a brake on the development of the world revolutionary process.

Marxists-Leninists believe that it is the cardinal task of the Communist parties to marshal all the peace-loving forces for the defence of peace and the deliverance of mankind from a nuclear disaster. They consider peaceful coexistence to be the general principle of relations between the socialist and the capitalist countries.

The Chinese leaders scorn this task. What they are doing, in effect, is whipping up the nuclear arms race and calling for new powers to join it. They are pursuing a line that is liable to cause an atomic war and consider the struggle for peace a secondary task, opposing it to the struggle for socialism.

The Marxists-Leninists consider it their duty to invigorate the unity and cohesion of the socialist community on the principles of Marxism-Leninism in every possible way, and to concentrate the special attention of the socialist countries on economic development in order that socialism wins the peaceful economic competition with capitalism.

The actions of the Chinese leaders are subverting and undermining the unity of the socialist camp. They are isolating China more and more from the other socialist countries. The CC CPC is underrating economic development and ignoring the tasks confronting the socialist countries in their economic competition against the capitalist countries. This policy tends to weaken the might of the socialist coun-

tries and impedes their current struggle against imperialism.

Marxists-Leninists, the working class of the capitalist countries have set themselves the task of stepping up the struggle against monopoly capital, in defence of the vital interests of the masses, of making maximum use of the now available opportunities to effect a peaceful socialist revolution not involving a civil war, and yet be ready for the non-peaceful way, for armed suppresson of bourgeois resistance.

In contrast, the CPC leaders vilify in every way the struggle of the working class and its communist vanguard for the vital interests of the working people, for peace and democracy, and reject the tactics of broad anti-monopoly aliances, the possibility of effecting socialist revolution peacefully. They call for reckless actions with arms in hand, in disregard of the existing situation.

Marxists-Leninists and the peoples fighting for national liberation consider it their duty to complete the anti-imperialist, democratic revolution, to create and consolidate the national front, and to work for the establishment of states of national democracy, for the non-capitalist way of development.

The Chinese leaders evade the essence of the present stage of the national liberation revolution. They are blind to the differences prevailing in the situation in the various countries and are offering the peoples of all countries just one prescription—armed struggle and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Such prescriptions may, if put into practice, undermine the national front and strengthen the positions of the colonialists and neo-colonialists.

Marxists-Leninists are eager to strengthen the unity and cohesion both of every individual Communist party and the entire army of Communists in the world on the basis of the principles laid down in the Declaration and the Statement.

The Chinese leaders are disrupting the unity of the Communist movement and of the democratic organisations. They are founding factions and are striving to split our movement and its national contingents.

In brief, the CPC leaders are opposing the Communist movement in all the basic questions of strategy and tactics.

Theirs is a course in which petty-bourgeois revolutionism and nationalistic, great-power aspirations merge.

In a malicious anti-Soviet article, slanderous from beginning to end, which appeared on February 4 in the CC CPC publications, the Chinese leaders declare for everybody to hear that they will step up their subversive activities against the world communist movement. In their nationalistic zeal they boast that they will continue their attacks on the CPSU in order to disorganise the work of the Party founded by the great Lenin.

It is absurd to make such threats against the Soviet Communists, the sons and daughters of the October Revolution, the pioneers of the new, communist world, who have withstood so many hard ordeals.

The Soviet Communists will not keep silent while the Chinese leaders prosecute an unbridled offensive upon our great cause of communist construction, the Leninist course of our Party and the standpoints of the world communist movement. We shall have to explain the substance of the anti-Marxist, neo-Trotskyite position of the Chinese leaders publicly.

Now, the task looms large of defending Marxism-Leninism from the distortions of the Chinese leaders. The interests of preserving the purity of the Marxist-Leninist teaching, the interests of the world communist movement and, in the final analysis, the interests of the Chinese people itself, require that we come out openly and strongly against the incorrect views and dangerous actions of the CPC leadership.

We stand for a strengthening of friendship with the Chinese people and are ready to develop co-operation with the CPR in all fields. The Soviet Communists have sincere sympathy for the great people of China. They have deep respect for the revolutionary traditions of the Communist Party of China. We are sure that nobody will ever succeed in disrupting the foundations of the friendship of the great Soviet and Chinese peoples and that the present attitude of the CPC leadership does not reflect the true national interests of the Chinese people. We will do everything in our power to bring back the relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China to a path that conforms with the rockbottom interests of the working class and all the working people of our countries.

We are fully aware of the danger of the present attitude of the Chinese leaders. The facts show that a grim and apparently long struggle lies ahead for the strengthening of the unity of all the socialist forces, for friendship and co-operation between the Soviet and Chinese peoples. It is now perfectly clear that the CPC leaders intend to persist in their incorrect stand, that they intend to carry on with their factional activities in the world communist movement. Together with the other fraternal parties, our Party will firmly defend Marxism-Leninism. It will firmly defend the unity and cohesion of the communist movement upon the principles of the Declaration and Statement of the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties. It will firmly defend the unity and cohesion of all the forces working for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

Our Party favours convening the next Meeting of fraternal parties in order to discuss the basic problems of our time and to hold the broadest possible exchange of opinions in the interest of surmounting the difficulties that have arisen in the communist movement. These difficulties stem from the CPC leadership's differences with the world communist movement. Collective efforts of all the fraternal parties are therefore perfectly justified in order to determine the necessary ways and means for preserving and stengthening the Marxist-Leninist unity of the communist ranks. It is perfectly clear to the CPSU that the meeting should serve this very purpose.

No matter how great the difficulties experienced by the world communist movement, the CC CPSU is certain that it will be strong enough to surmount them and to cement its ranks in the struggle for the great communist cause.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue to pursue the policy of promoting unity with the fraternal parties on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles and proletarian internationalism and on the basis of the programme documents of the world communist movement —the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

The road followed by our Party, by the world communist movement is the Leninist road and therefore the only true road. We have adopted a new Programme, in which we charted our development twenty years ahead. Fulfilment of this Programme, determined and purposeful progress to the heights of communism, is considered by our Party and the whole Soviet people as their supreme internationalist duty to the international working class and communist movement. As always, our Party will perform its internationalist duty honourably!

Under the invincible banner of the great Lenin, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue consistently and undeviatingly to pursue the line of fulfilling the CPSU Programme for the building in our country of the most just social system, communism.

FIDELITY TO PRINCIPLES OF MARXISM-LENINISM

Pravda Leader, April 3, 1964

The Soviet Communists, all the Soviet people have been informed in the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU of July 14, 1963, about the situation that has arisen in the world communist movement through the fault of the leaders of the Communist Party of China, who come out with a special ideological and political platform that runs counter to the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960. Having launched fierce polemics against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist Parties, the CPC leadership has transferred the ideological differences to interstate relations between the People's Republic of China and the other socialist countries, has gone over to open political struggle directed towards splitting the community of the socialist countries and the world communist movement.

Together with the other Marxist-Leninist Parties, the CPSU has exerted every effort to stop the dangerous development of events, to strengthen the unity of the Communists of all countries. Displaying utmost restraint and patience, explaining to the Chinese leaders the erroneousness and danger of their present positions, our Party has taken a number of fresh steps in order to overcome the dif-

ficulties and to normalise the situation in the communist movement.

On October 25 and November 7, 1963, N. S. Khrushchov in his speeches, published in the press again proposed that public polemics be stopped.

On November 29, 1963, the CPSU Central Committee sent a letter to the Central Committee of the CPC in which it again proposed that open polemics be stopped, and advanced a programme of concrete measures the implementation of which would normalise the relations between our parties and countries, and would improve the atmosphere in the world communist movement. At the same time, the Soviet Union had unilaterally stopped publishing polemical items.

This display of good will on the part of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was highly appraised by the fraternal parties, which on their part have done much to persuade the CPC leaders to give up their erroneous line. However, Peking did not deem it necessary to reckon with the opinion of the fraternal parties, with the interests of the communist movement, did not wish to heed the voice of those who hold dear the interests of the great revolutionary cause.

The Chinese leaders appraised in their own way the readiness of the Communist Parties to do everything necessary to overcome the difficulties. They interpreted this as a sign of weakness of the fraternal parties. Ignoring the constructive proposals of the CPSU and the other fraternal parties, the Chinese leadership started a new round of an even more base and fierce campaign against our Party and country, against all the Marxists-Leninists.

Jenminjihpao alone published more than 200 anti-Soviet articles and other items since November 1963. Particularly insolent was the editorial carried by **Jenminjihpao** and **Hungchi** on February 4, in which attempts are made to substantiate the inevitability of a split in the international communist movement. Without shunning any insinuations against our Party and the Soviet people, the Chinese leaders went to such monstrous fabrications as

to accuse the CPSU of "collusion with imperialism" and "betrayal of the cause of the socialist revolution."

The CPC leaders are trying to obliterate from the minds of the Chinese workers, peasants and intellectuals every good feeling towards the Soviet brothers. Violating the elementary standards of relations between states, they are intensifying hostile propaganda against the Soviet Union. The Peking broadcasts in the Russian language in the past period have been full of slanderous inventions and anti-Soviet attacks. The Chinese representatives launched subversive, splitting activities against the fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties, using for these purposes all kinds of renegades and outcasts, Trotskyites and other traitors to the cause of the revolution. The Chinese representatives are also conducting splitting activities in the mass international organisations with a view to weakening their influence in the struggle of the peoples against imperialism and colonialism, for strengthening peace.

The Chinese leaders are trying in every way to impose their conclusions upon the fraternal parties as though the special course of the CPC leaders is the only correct one, while the collectively worked-out line of the international communist movement is an erroneous one.

In these conditions our Party considers it its duty to resolutely come out in defence of the purity of the Marxist-Leninist principles, the general line of the international communist movement. Far from doing any good, our further silence would only encourage the strivings of the Chinese leaders to disorganise the ranks of the international communist movement and weaken it as the main revolutionary force in the struggle against imperialism.

After discussing the report by M. A. Suslov, Member of the Presidium and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the February Plenary Meeting, the Central Committee adopted a decision to expose the anti-Leninist views and splitting activities of the Chinese leadership. In keeping with the standards of relations inside the communist movement, the Central Committee of the CPSU consulted

with the fraternal parties about the planned measures which met with their understanding and support.

In the course of the consultations the leaders of one of the fraternal Parties expressed the wish that the CPSU Central Committee temporarily postpone the publication of the materials of the Plenary Meeting as they decided to make another attempt to stop the open polemics. The initiative of this fraternal Party was turned down in Peking. The CPC leaders, by all their activity, showed that, far from stopping the polemics, they intend to intensify their attacks on the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist Parties.

The leaders of the CPC only after three months replied to the letter of the CPSU Central Committee of November 29, 1963. However, the reply from the CPC Central Committee of February 29 last in essence rejected all the constructive proposals advanced by the CPSU Central Committee, including the proposal of stopping open polemics.

On March 7 the CPSU Central Committee addressed a new letter to the CPC Central Committee with the proposal of stopping polemics and carrying out measures aimed at furthering the cohesion of the world communist movement on a principled Marxist-Leninist basis.

The CPSU Central Committee proposed a meeting of CPSU and CPC delegations in May 1964, a meeting of representatives of Communist Parties—participants in the drafting commission which prepared the 1960 Moscow Meeting, in June-July 1964, and a meeting of all fraternal Parties in the autumn of 1964.

After this letter the Chinese leaders, far from stopping the polemics, developed them with even greater bitterness.

Starting with the second half of March, the Chinese press considerably expanded the hostile campaign against the CPSU and the USSR, against all fraternal countries and Parties which reject the "special course" of the CPC leadership. The climax of this campaign was the editorial article in **Jenminjihpao** and **Hungchi** of March 31 which from the very beginning to the end is a most vile insult to our Party and the entire Soviet people, an open revision of the basic propositions of Marxism-Leninism. The

article was written in a tone unthinkable in relations between like-minded people. It fully showed that the CPC leaders have gone beyond all limits in their political struggle against the world communist movement, singling out the CPSU and the Soviet Union as the centre for their attacks.

The Chinese leadership has also intensified its splitting activities. During the session of the Council of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation, recently held in Algiers, the Chinese representatives came out with foul accusations against the Soviet Union. Splitting, neo-Trotskyite groups, counterposing the Communist Parties in a number of capitalist countries, have become active with the obvious blessing of Peking.

Striving to achieve their special political aims which have nothing in common with the struggle for socialism, the CPC leaders do not disdain to use any means, conduct a hypocritical game around major issues of the unity of the world communist movement. Blackmailing Marxist-Leninist Parties with threats of splitting them and exploiting the natural desire of Communists for unity, they attempt to bind the Communist Parties hand and foot, to hinder them in exposing the ideological apostasy and splitting activities of the CPC leadership.

This is why the Central Committee of the CPSU decided to publish the materials of the February Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee, to come out with a criticism of the anti-Leninist platform and splitting activities of the Chinese leadership. This is demanded by the interests of the struggle for the purity of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory, for the policy of the world communist movement expressed in the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow Meetings.

It is necessary to resolutely and persistently fight for the unity of the international communist movement, the way it was done by the great Lenin, when irreconcilably coming out against opportunists of all shades, against revisionists, dogmatists, Trotskyites and "heroes of the Left revolutionary phrase."

True to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, our Party is prepared in the future as well to search for ways and means of overcoming the difficulties which have arisen, of removing the differences between the Chinese leaders and the CPSU and the other fraternal Parties. Our Party and its Leninist Central Committee, headed by Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, have done and will continue in the future as well to do everything necessary for strengthening the unity of the world communist movement, for rallying all forces coming out for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. It will make its worthy contribution to the great struggle for the triumph of our common revolutionary Marxist-Leninist cause.

CONTENTS

Pages

The Decision of the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU Adopted on February 15, 1964 3

Report of Mikhail SUSLOV, Member of Presidium and Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU on February 14, 1964 . . . 7

Pravda Leader, April 3, 1964 105